

151.1 M82m

Moran \$2.50
Makers of America
438

151.1 M82m

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.

$$\begin{array}{r} 204 + 28 \\ \hline 230 \end{array}$$

DEC 17 41
DEC 18 41 R 41
MAY 31 42 3
28 44 06
APR 24 44 X 206
JUN 10 44 16 4
MAY 21 45 30

MAKERS OF AMERICA

Significant Factors In The Ancestry and Social Inheritance of Leading Americans

A Study of the Lives of Sixty-three Persons Elected to the
American Hall of Fame, from the Point of View of their
Heredity, Social and Economic Status, Education,
Religion and Moral Training, in an Attempt
to Discover Significant Factors in their
Early Years

By

HUGH ANDERSON MORAN, PH. D.

COPIES MAY BE HAD FROM THE CORNELL UNITED
RELIGIOUS WORK, BARNES HALL, ITHACA, N. Y.

ITHACA, NEW YORK, 1936

Copyright 1936
HUGH A. MORAN
ITHACA, N. Y.

Table of Contents

<i>Chap.</i>	<i>Page</i>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	vii
I. FATHERS OF FAMOUS AMERICANS	1
II. MOTHERS OF FAMOUS AMERICANS	19
III. ANCESTORS OF FAMOUS AMERICANS	31
IV. DOMINANT INFLUENCES ON FAMOUS AMERICANS ..	41
V. CHILDHOOD OF FAMOUS AMERICANS	55
VI. SCHOOLING OF FAMOUS AMERICANS	75
VII. HIGHER EDUCATION OF FAMOUS AMERICANS	89
VIII. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF FAMOUS AMERICANS	99
IX. ADULT PERSONAL LIFE	119
X. MOTIVES, IDEALS AND PURPOSES	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	187
APPENDIX	197

Acknowledgments

THE writer wishes to express his grateful appreciation to the many friends who have so generously given of their time in assisting him with this study. While he cannot mention them all by name, special thanks are due to Professor Harrison S. Elliott for his wise guidance and unfailing help, to Dr. William W. Rockwell for his friendly courtesy and the great care which he bestowed upon the manuscript, to Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, Dr. Goodwin B. Watson, and Dr. Hugh Hartshorne for repeated counsel and advice, and to Mrs. Stanton Faucett for her patient and untiring labor in copying the volume. He wishes to thank also those authors and publishers whose permission to quote has been granted and the National Council on Religion in Higher Education whose support in large measure made the study possible.

Introduction

THIS is a study of the lives of sixty-three individuals, elected to the American Hall of Fame, from the point of view of their heredity, social and economic status, education, religious and moral training, in an attempt to discover significant factors in their early years. Those elected to the Hall of Fame were chosen for the study for several reasons. It was desirable that the individuals studied should represent a sampling of successful leaders of American life as regards the period in which they lived, social class, occupation and education. It was desirable also that they should be sufficiently well known that the desired data would be available, and that the list should be chosen by an impartial jury and hence not weighted for any particular theory of education or religion. Those elected to the Hall of Fame seemed to meet these criteria.

The American Hall of Fame is an unofficial honorary foundation, connected with New York University. This foundation was endowed in 1900, and a handsome building with colonnades erected at the university, on the heights overlooking the Palisades of the Hudson and the Harlem River. Here ceremonies are held from time to time commemorative of the deeds of great Americans who have been elected to the Hall. Election is based upon general popular nomination. One hundred prominent citizens throughout the country cooperate as electors. They vote upon a list compiled by the foundation from those popularly nominated under the direction and with the final approval of the Senate of New York University.

Originally twenty-nine persons were selected. From time to time others have been added, until there were in 1926, at the time this study was begun, the names of fifty-six men, and seven women on the list, sixty-three in all. Separate lists were formerly kept for women, and for men of foreign birth, but all

such distinctions have now ceased. All nominees for election are classed under one of the following heads: (1) Authors and Editors, (2) Educators, (3) Preachers, Theologians, (4) Philanthropists, Reformers, Home and Social Workers, (5) Scientists, (6) Engineers, (7) Physicians, Surgeons, (8) Inventors, (9) Missionaries, Explorers, (10) Soldiers, Sailors, (11) Lawyers, Judges, (12) Rulers, Statesmen, (13) Business Men, (14) Artists, Musicians, Sculptors, Painters, (15) Distinguished men and women outside the above classes.

There is one important limitation in the selection of this list. They are all outstandingly successful individuals. It would have been desirable for comparative purposes to have had also the lives of individuals of equal capacity but who failed in achievement, along the lines in which those elected to the Hall of Fame made a success. If they proved to have had similar early influences, then the significance of the factors would be discounted. Such a comparative study was impossible, however, because the biographical material would not be available, even if there were any way of selecting a comparable list.

Despite this limitation, the individuals elected to the Hall of Fame seemed to represent a desirable group for study. First, even among successful individuals there is sufficient negative material to be found to give the basis for evaluation. Humanity is generally subject to fault, error and failure in varying degree, and even the greatest and best have sufficient shadows in their lives to make the picture visible. Second, a study of positive and successful experience in religious and character education may be more useful than a study of the experience of abnormal and delinquent persons. Third, the results found in the sixty-three cases chosen can in some degree be checked against general statistics insofar as these are extant and the facts discovered can to some extent be placed on the total scale of American life for the period.

The method of the study is biographical. Instead of the more usual procedure of character study at the present time by

the use of questionnaires and tests for collecting material from living persons, this is a study of the biographies of individuals whose careers are closed, to see what material may be available in the field of character and religious education. Various facts concerning the origin, development and character of the chosen individuals have been collected, sorted, classified, analyzed and compared. In developing the problem, a few biographies were first read in order roughly to estimate the type of material available and the categories under which the data might be summarized. The experience of the writer in a former study, made for the religious education of a group of high school boys and published under the title, "Heroes," (Association Press, 1919) was also used. A form was then drawn up, a copy of which is found in the Appendix, stating one hundred and six points on which information was desirable in the case of each biography to be studied. These points included in the main information regarding:

- (1) The ancestry, family, the physical and social heredity of the individual.
- (2) The education, occupations, social and economic status, religious and moral life of the parents and grandparents.
- (3) The home life, health, physique, and training of the individual as a child.
- (4) His education, his social and religious environment during the formative period of youth.
- (5) His career and his own social, moral and religious life.
- (6) Any known ideals, motives, urges or purposes.

Having once prepared forms or information sheets, the biographies were chosen and read in no particular alphabetical or other order, but chiefly as desirable books were found. Notes were taken and passages marked during the first general reading. After the leading available biographies about a single character had been completely read, the desired facts were filled in with the total picture in mind. In very many cases

other facts have come to light later, and additions and corrections have been made accordingly. While a well defined plan was followed from the early beginning of the study, certain modifications had to be made during its progress. As the data sheets were filled out, trial balances were drawn from time to time. In view of the results, corrections in procedure were made, a few categories abandoned for lack of data, and others added.

One of the major difficulties has been the lack of well defined criteria for classification. Certain facts were simple and easy to record—such as dates, place of birth, and age of entering school. It was a comparatively easy step from this to draw up criteria for rating education, for example, as excellent, moderate or limited. Such criteria are stated in terms relative to the standards and achievements of the day, and where pertinent a comparison was hazarded with the standards of the present day. Questions such as discipline were also in the field of behavior, and could be rated with slightly more difficulty on a like comparative scale. As one approached the field of character and subjective states the problem became increasingly difficult. For example—*Conscientious*. How can one measure degrees of conscientiousness? The procedure was to try rating a few people on their display of conscience, analyse the results, and draw up a behavior pattern, showing the major field in which conscientiousness is exhibited. Then try again. After several such attempts, fairly objective criteria could be stated, according to which a given person might be classed as extremely conscientious, moderately conscientious, moderately lax, or lax, and all the subjects should be classed in one of these groups. While this method may not bring the accurate results of an exact science, it provides a systematic procedure whereby character traits can be profitably analysed and compared. Attention has been constantly kept upon the revision of the criteria toward greater clarity, and the readjustment of the data in view of the criteria, toward greater accuracy.

The facts collected have been gathered into 94 charts or

tables, in most of which 100% equals 63, the number of characters under review. Following the tables, the material in them is discussed in chapters dealing with fathers, mothers, ancestors, childhood, home conditions and personal traits, education, religion, moral point of view, achievements and motivation. In so far as findings are recorded, no attempt is made to apply the results to actual present day problems of religious and moral education. The task has been to analyse the facts, in the hope of discovering some principles, directions, and tendencies which may add to the store of human knowledge.

The study by its very nature has two definite limitations. First, it was manifestly impossible to do original biographical research in a study of so large a number of people. Consequently, the plan for the dissertation provided for the use of standard biographies. It was believed, and the belief proved upon the whole to be warranted, that because these characters are well known, adequate biographical material would be available. Where the material in standard biographies could not be found, supplementary work was done in original sources, but the dissertation has upon the whole depended upon secondary sources and in no sense claims to be an original contribution in the realm of biographical research. A by-product of the study has been a series of interpretive biographies of the characters written upon the basis of the study made, but these are not a part of the dissertation.

A check upon this use of secondary sources has been made in various ways. Where several biographies were available, a careful comparison was made of the information in these biographies on the items used in the dissertation. Further, especial attention was given to possible bias of the biographers. Perhaps the morality of some of the men, both social and economic, might have to be discounted. There may have been cases where sharp practise or low ideal was never discovered, or where a biographical source was compiled by a wife, a son, or a devoted admirer. But even here the light is rather pitiless

—foibles and weaknesses appear with astonishing honesty, or even by the very devices for concealing them. An apology is more revealing than an accusation. By use of the comparative method, especially in the study of biographical material relative to men who belonged to opposing factions, or who played different rôles in the same events, it has been possible in some cases to eliminate error and to arrive at an accurate determination of particular facts.

In the majority of cases cross references were found, for almost all of the persons whose lives were studied were *intimate with a group* of the others on the list. Thus light would be thrown from one to another. For example, Asa Gray wrote the life of his friend, Joseph Henry; Irving wrote the life of Washington; Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote a biography of his friend, Ralph Waldo Emerson. A half dozen of the chosen characters belonged to the famous Saturday Club in Boston. Another group, largely from the South, were friends, fellow-workers, and at times rivals and opponents in the Revolutionary War and the founding of the Republic. It was found convenient, therefore, and seemingly in the interest of greater final accuracy, to approach summaries by degrees.

Conflicting statements were found chiefly regarding men active in the political area of life,—men like Jefferson, Hamilton, Patrick Henry, Henry Clay and Andrew Jackson. While these men were themselves men of great ability and high personal character, their partisans would go to great lengths in order to vilify a political opponent or to conceal a fault or foible of a favorite. Considerable research has been necessary in such cases to arrive at a fair judgment of the character of a single individual, and extensive reading was required to establish some single point of controversy. Fortunately in all of these cases the chief actors on both sides of the controversy, as Hamilton and Jefferson, or Clay and Jackson, were both on the list studied. Research into the life and activity of the one inevitably threw light upon the controversy regarding the character of the other. For example, a chance remark in the

correspondence of Thomas Jefferson with John Adams gives a clue to the animus of Jefferson when he so kindly corrected the manuscript of William Wirt's *Life of Patrick Henry* before its publication. With the help of this clue it is possible to make important corrections in the distorted picture commonly held of Patrick Henry.

In some cases but a single biography is available, as for example Dr. George H. Palmer's *Life of Alice Freeman Palmer*, where the biography, by its brilliant and clear presentation has done much to make the character. Were other biographical sources regarding any one of these persons at hand, controversial points would undoubtedly arise. But *in very few of the lives studied is there any serious question regarding major facts which would seriously affect the findings of this study.*

In the case of few if any individuals was the desired information completely available. Concerning three or four of the lives the material was extremely scanty. But at least some major facts were found in every case; and in connection with most of the characters studied material has been collected toward answering a majority of the questions listed. Around such idolized individuals as Washington and Lincoln, a vast literature has grown up, from which the selection of the pertinent facts was no easy task, owing to the conflicting statements of different biographers. The books have been in most cases purchased, but where library copies were used, extensive passages have been copied out, in order that the connotations of any particular statement might be exactly considered before it should be incorporated in the text. Many of the spaces that still remain blank in certain of the form sheets could be filled by sufficiently painstaking research. One could spend a lifetime searching out details on any one of the characters. It seemed best therefore to proceed with the extensive data already collected, while recognizing at the same time the limitations in the material.

A second limitation concerns the significance of the results. What leaders in character and religious education are

most interested to discover are the factors making for success or failure. Such causal factors, if they could be discovered, would be of help in determining the emphasis and direction in character and religious education. It is evident that great caution must be observed in drawing any conclusions in regard to causal relationship. There are not a sufficient number of biographies to make the results statistically significant, so that any facts discovered can be said to be true of this particular selected group and in no sense widely representative of the population in the times in which these individuals lived. There are too many biographies to make possible the kind of case studies which might reveal relationships between heredity and environmental factors on the one hand, and the achievement of these individuals on the other; and it is doubtful, in any event, whether the requisite material for such case studies could be discovered for most of these individuals. While, therefore, not claiming a causal relationship between the facts discovered and the characteristics and achievements of the individuals studied, the comparative summaries of this study do seem to be of importance. They represent a picture of the various factors in the ancestry and training of a considerable number of successful individuals and at least show what influences were operative in their lives. Such summaries point to possible factors which make for success or failure and raise definite questions for further study and research. They represent also a composite picture of the ancestry and training of this significant group of Americans.

The writer has been long interested in this subject of the biographical approach to character education. This present study had been outlined and was already under way at the time of the appearance of General Jan C. Smuts' important philosophical work, *Holism and Evolution*. The high place which General Smuts gives to the systematic study of biography in the development of the culture of the future was most heartening in the pursuit of this study. General Smuts says, "On the whole lives of poets, artists, writers, thinkers, re-

ligious and social innovators will be found the most suitable for the purposes of historic study. . . . We should select the biographies of people who had inner histories, lives of the spirit as well as of a fair capacity of continuous development during their life time. Among these the most helpful cases would be those where the written record is fairly full in the form of writings and diaries, and where there has been no undue restraint in the process of self-revelation and faithful portrayal of the inner life and history.”¹

Experience in this study confirms what General Smuts has there stated. The writer is also impressed with the “holistic” aspect of character, the idea of the personality as a whole, on which so much emphasis is laid. He has not, however, been able to pursue this study of character through biography to anything like the lengths outlined by General Smuts in the succeeding paragraphs, but only to make an introduction, as it were, to this vast and vastly important area of human study. General Smuts continues, “Personality has thus been explained above as personal Holism, as the whole in its human fulness of development. . . . What should be the procedure of this new discipline of Personology? It should of course take cognizance of the special analytical contributions of psychology and physiology, and of all the other human sciences, individual and social, theoretical and practical. But it should do more. Following the course above indicated, that the Personality is uniquely individual and that this special individual character should not be ignored, it should study the biography of noted personalities as expressions of the developing Personality in each case. Such a study of personal biographies will not only have the advantage of bringing out the individual differences among personalities, instead of blurring all differences in a generalized composite picture of Personality. It will have the further and quite priceless advantage of studying personalities synthetically as living unities and wholes rather than in the analytical manner of psychology and the other human sciences. In biography we have to follow the de-

velopment of a person as a whole, as a living biological psychical entity, and we are therefore in a position to correct the one-sided abstract generalized results of the analytical procedure of these sciences. The study of biographies as examples of personal Holism, as examples of the development of Personality, will lead to very interesting and important results.

"In the first place, we shall thus get the materials for formulating the laws of personal evolution. In the second place those laws will form the foundation of a new science of Biography which will take the place of the empirical unsatisfactory patchwork affair which biography now mostly is. In the third place, the gradual accumulation of biographical facts and data bearing on personal evolution will not only lead to the formulation of the laws of this evolution, but will give the basis for a sound theory of Personality and a proper science of Personology. *Personology as the science of Personality, as the synthetic science of Human Nature, will form the crown of all the sciences and in turn become the basis of a new Ethic, a new Metaphysic, and of a truer spiritual outlook than we can possibly have in the ignorance and confusions of our present state of knowledge.* To my mind the basis of all these great developments can only be laid in a new biographical aim and method, which will give us the facts which are vitally necessary for any sound scientific constructions."¹

¹ Smuts, Jan C. *Holism and Evolution*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1926, p. 281 ff.

CHAPTER I.

FATHERS OF FAMOUS AMERICANS

Fathers of Famous Americans

		Table			
<i>Chief Occupation</i>		<i>Education</i>		<i>Social Status</i>	
Farmer	14	Excellent	28	High	35
Minister	11	Moderate	16	Middle	20
Planter	7	Limited	18	Low	8
Lawyer	6	No information	1		
Merchant	5				
Physician	3				
Mechanic	3				
Surveyor, etc.	2				
Tanner	2				
Actor	1				
Dyer, <i>et al.</i>	1				
Hatter, <i>et al.</i>	1				
Naval Officer	1				
Sea Captain	1				
Shoemaker	1				
Tailor	1				
Teacher	1				
Tradesman, <i>et al.</i>	1				
No information	1				
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
Total	63		63		63
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
<i>Success</i>		<i>Religion</i>		<i>Character</i>	
Eminent	31	Puritan, Con-		Excellent	49
Moderate	20	gregational or		Medium	7
Poor	8	Presbyterian	32	Poor	3
No information	4	Episcopalian	8	No informa-	
		Unitarian	4	tion	4
		Baptist	3		
		Quaker	4		
		Roman Catholic	1		
		Mason	1		
		No information	10		
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
Totals	63		63		63

Fathers of Famous Americans

Criteria

IN A study into the moral and religious education of a group of people, the initial problem is to isolate the different influences which affected their childhood, and to sort out those influences under different heads and sub-heads. The major questions have been grouped under the home, the school, the church and the community, and the nature of the individual himself. A natural place to start is with the fathers,—their occupation, education, social status, success, religion, and any other available information to be had about them. Following that, the mothers, then the grand parents, and ancestry.

The fathers are of special importance because their education, occupation, and success so largely determine the economic conditions and material surroundings of the home. The mothers are of special importance because they are more intimately associated with the child in early life, and because they bring down from their maternal side the social heritage, in the form of home, habits and housekeeping.

In classifying people, habits and customs, one has not quite the objectivity that he has when dealing, for example, with geological specimens. Such a question as the occupation of the father is comparatively objective and easy to classify. Where the fathers changed occupations or had more than one, they are classed under the major occupation, and the variations are briefly discussed in the appropriate place. Such questions as education and social status are not so readily disposed of. Where there was not special reason for doing otherwise, three classes were formed,—for after taking away the best and the worst, one has the middle group left. But just where to draw the line in each case was the question. As in other scientific classifications an arbitrary standard had to be set,

and there were always borderline cases, though scarcely more than are to be found in dealing with geological or botanical specimens.

In education of fathers the standard set was a college education or its equivalent, excellent. A common school education in the three R's, without any later indication of higher scholarship was classed as moderate; the ability barely to read and write and sign one's name, is classed as limited. Even one who could not sign his name would be put in the limited class, if an intelligent farmer or frontiersman.

The criteria for social status are a little more diffuse, particularly in view of the fact that social distinctions in the colonies were much less marked than they were in the mother countries, and many people soon changed their social status on this side of the Atlantic. Franklin's blacksmith grandfather in England would be classed clearly as of low social status; the Beechers' blacksmith grandfather in New Haven would be clearly middle class. Such matters are relative. In view of colonial conditions, where there was no hereditary nobility, high social status was ascribed to (1) Planters and other men of affairs closely connected with the governing class in Great Britain, and (2) professional people (ministers, lawyers, and doctors or their sons and daughters) who belonged to the highest social group in the community. The Middle Class constitutes small farmers, small shop keepers, and their friends, who were distinctly respectable but unpretentious. In low social status are found day laborers, tenant farmers of the poorer sort, and ne'er-do-wells who had no particular ancestors or occupations.

Success is also somewhat difficult to delimit. In many cases the biographers themselves class a particular father as "eminently successful," which gives something on which to go. Into that class have been put, (1) Men of large affairs whether inherited or not, (2) professional men who struggled for an education, got it, and shone in their profession, and (3) any others who distinctly raised themselves from a lower to a

higher social status while at the same time providing ample support for their families. In the moderately successful class are placed those who were satisfied to get along with limited means and no marked achievement, and quit approximately where they began. Under small success are to be found those who for whatever reason failed to at least modestly support their families, for any other reason than premature death.

In religion the classifications are first by denominational connection (or lack of it). Beyond that classification is largely a matter of individual expression, and behavior. Such points as church attendance and offices held, personal prayer habits, family worship, and religious teaching by the parent, have been gathered and briefly presented under the topic "Religion of the Parents." A home where there were daily family prayers, or regular instruction by one of the parents in the Bible, Prayer Book, books of devotion, or catechism is classed as "distinctly religious."

In character those have been classed excellent who were good citizens, good husbands and fathers, supported their families, and where, with fair biographical material available, there is no known major scandal in their business affairs or marital relationships. Those of medium character were so classed because they accomplished the major task of holding together and rearing a family, but had some marked weakness or flaw which prevented them from doing so with *éclat* and distinction. Under poor character are classed those of persistent marital unfaithfulness, or other major fault which made a successful home impossible.

I. Chief Occupation.

The fathers of the Americans in the Hall of Fame are classed as, 14 farmers, 11 ministers, 7 planters,—a life quite distinct from that of the New England farm, where most of the work was done by the farmer and his family,—6 lawyers, 5 merchants, 3 physicians, 3 mechanics, 2 surveyors, 2 tanners, and one each, actor, dyer, hatter, naval officer, sea captain,

shoe maker, tailor, teacher, tradesman, and unclassified. Some of these fathers had several occupations, like John Adams, who was lawyer, statesman, president, but his chosen profession which he never fully abandoned was that of lawyer. He is therefore thus classed,—or Peter Cooper's father, who was hatter, brick maker, builder and soldier, but chiefly a hatter.

It would appear from these figures that the ministers' sons far outrank all other classes in percent. The only ones in the list to be considered at all are the first five, farmers, ministers, planters, lawyers, and merchants. There were approximately as many doctors and lawyers as there were ministers in the country, yet doctors' sons rank 3, lawyers 6 and ministers 11.¹ Taking planter and farmer together they provide 21 of the parents, not quite twice the number of ministers' sons and daughters. But there were approximately one hundred twenty times as many farmers in the country as there were ministers. According to these figures at the ratio of ministers' sons in the Hall of Fame, there should have been 1320 farmers' sons selected instead of 21. Or putting it in another form, the individual minister's son had sixty times as good a chance for election as the farmer's son.

On examination of this list it will at first sight seem strange that only one is classed as the daughter of a teacher. This is understood when we remind ourselves that until the growth of the public school in the second half of the nineteenth century, many teachers were primarily ministers, and many ministers taught in the academy or took in students or boarding scholars. Many even of those who gave their full time to teaching were generally educated for the ministry, or young men halted for a time in their preparation for the ministry. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Marshall, Hamilton, Patrick Henry, practically all of the Southern coterie either had a Scotch minister as a tutor living in the home or lived in a minister's home to be tutored. Amongst the other groups, a large proportion received their education in part at least from

a minister. This is a fact that came out unexpectedly in the process of the study, so that full statistics have not been gathered upon it.² It will be referred to further under the heading of schooling.

Certainly there seems an important connection in the fact that the function of father and teacher, or teacher and minister were often combined in one and the same person,—sometimes all three functions—that the child was treated therefore as a unit, with a harmonious background for home, church and school. And it is notable that these minister-fathers, though poor, bent every effort to secure the best higher education for their children.

An outstanding example of a ministerial father is Dr. Lyman Beecher, the father of both Henry Ward Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe, the only father of two members of the Hall of Fame. Dr. Beecher was a leading Calvinist minister, whose father, David, was a blacksmith and whose mother, was of sturdy New England farmer stock. She took Yale students to board, and from them David Beecher got something of a higher education. Their son Lyman therefore was sent to college and aspired to the ministry.³ Such was Dr. Lyman Beecher's success both as father and as minister, that all of his seven sons became ministers, one of the two daughters married a minister, and the eldest, Catherine, was the head of a school fostered by the church. Dr. Beecher had no special system of religious education nor unusual theory of character training. Important factors seem to be that the salary was small, and the family were generally in straitened circumstances; Dr. Beecher went far toward practising what he preached, and there was an especially close tie of devotion between the members of the family.

Typical of farmer parentage was John Whittier, father of John Greenleaf Whittier, poet. John Whittier's father's family were Puritans of Quaker leanings; his mother, Sarah Greenleaf, was a Quakeress. Their life was exceeding simple, the quiet routine of the days and seasons interrupted only by the

still more quiet Quaker Sabbath. To them the Bible was *The Book*, and the family library filled but a single shelf.⁴ John Whittier's entire estate was worth a scant thousand dollars, yet by unremitting toil he was able to wring a comfortable livelihood for seven or eight people from the thin soil of the little New England farm. He thus provided the economic basis for his talented son's support. He did not encourage the son's early literary aspirations, for his religion held up a severely plain ideal, but the industry, the quiet reverence, the frugality, the deep piety of the father, set in large measure the molds of John Greenleaf Whittier's future character.

Of Southern planter as a father we find an interesting example in John, the father of Patrick Henry, an emigrant from Scotland, of good family and education, but no property, who came over in search of fortune, married the widow Syme and thereafter managed her plantation. He had numerous other occupations, for he was colonel of the regiment, chief surveyor of Hanover County, and presiding judge of the county court, to which he added that of schoolmaster, by setting up with his brother, the Reverend Patrick Henry, a grammar school at his own house.⁵ But he also had numerous offspring and an expensive family. Young Patrick did not care for school, and could seldom be found when lessons began. Instead he would be following the chase or lying idly beside a pool, watching a cork, from which a fish hook was suspended. At the age of fifteen his father set him up in business with a brother William, slightly older than himself. It took one year to wreck the business and several more for Patrick to straighten out its tangled affairs.⁶ Next his father set him up to a farm, with a house and several slaves, Patrick having in the meantime married. That was soon lost, and after one more attempt at trade, Patrick and his small family went to live with his father-in-law, who kept the village tavern. The father had thus given Patrick his chance with all too little guidance at the two major occupations in the colony, farming and trade, and he having failed, the father took no more responsibility.

It was a loose trial and error method, with a large element of error and failure. In Patrick's case the adverse environmental factors were matched and out-weighed by his native good sense and the discipline and religious training which he received from his mother, who was a Calvinist, and from the Reverend Samuel Davies, whose sermons he had to outline to his mother.⁷

One other type of father seems to be quite outstanding in a number of cases—the visionary and unsuccessful—John Clemens, father of Mark Twain, Moss Kent, Poe, Farragut, Bernard Saint-Gaudens, we could list a number to a greater or less degree coming under this description, men who appear to have had high mental qualities, but who were either unstable nervously or misadjusted vocationally. Perhaps the best example is that of John Cooper, father of Peter, the successful business man and philanthropist. John Cooper was bred to the hatter's trade, and at the age of about twenty years entered the ranks of the revolutionary army, where he rose to a lieutenancy and married the daughter of his general. Here we see a man with his routine broken and his imagination fired by long military service, with little education but a keen mind, returning to the irksome conditions of a small handicraft. He was not averse to hard work, but he was unhappy in his work,—he moved often, always hoping to better his condition, usually with the opposite results. And from time to time he would give up the trade to which he had been apprenticed to try some other, such as brick-maker, brewer, and builder, as though to go through the alphabet, but in each case returned to the hatter's trade, as a last resource. Peter Cooper shared his father's fortunes. From him the son learned habits of industry. He seems also to have shared his father's enthusiasms and religious interest. For a time it looked as though he would complete his father's unfinished alphabet with the occupation of carriage builder, store-keeper and soap-maker, but he had just the elements which his father lacked for success. Possible explanations of these elements of success are:

(1) That he inherited an added stability from his mother,
or

(2) that he had better training from his mother,

(3) that his life was not interrupted by military service,

(4) that he learned from his father's mistakes,

(5) that he lived in a time of stability and expansion which gave him better opportunity than his father,

(6) that he was vocationally better adjusted than his father.

Data are not sufficient in number and accuracy to give relative weight to all these considerations, but after comparing them in the cases of the other visionary but unsuccessful fathers, one tends to give major weight to the two first points, (1) heredity from the mother's side, which brought the proper blend of emotional stability, and (2) more careful training on the part of a mother who was herself a person of ability and stability. It is probable also that there was a definite reaction in the mother's training and the son's motivation against the father's failings as is suggested in point four.

II. *Education of Fathers.*

In education the fathers ranked 28 excellent, 16 moderate, 18 limited, and 1, no information. Eighteen of the fathers had a college education, and the other ten listed as excellent had an equivalent, such men as John Henry, father of Patrick, who was able to teach Latin and Greek, and was county judge and surveyor; Richard Henry Lee, who was governor of Virginia, and had one of the best libraries in the state; or William Mitchell, who was a schoolmaster, astronomer, and banker, and taught his daughter Maria her mathematics and astronomy. In looking back through the attainments of these fathers one finds that he has, if anything, under estimated rather than over estimated them. The public educational facilities were limited, but many men of superior intellect and taste succeeded in becoming self-taught far beyond any reasonable expectation according to their visible opportunities.

Accurate figures of comparison are not available, but a picture of the situation may be attained. Up to 1776, at the beginning of the revolution, there were but seven colleges in the thirteen colonies, (all of them distinctly religious foundations) with an average of slightly over 100 graduates per year for all seven.⁸ The average year of birth of all the fathers was 1755 (allowing thirty years for the father's age where the exact date of the father's birth is not known; fifty-four of the sixty-three fathers were born in the 18th century, which lends some weight to this calculation). The year 1775 was the average date when the fathers who took a higher education would finish college, and it is noteworthy how many of them were actually of that period. At a time therefore when not over one hundred ten were graduating each year in all thirteen colonies, eighteen out of sixty-three fathers were college graduates, or twenty-eight percent, as against eight tenths of one percent of the adult male population who were college graduates. Add to this the fact that an additional ten of the fathers had an equivalent of a college education, we see that there is a strong correlation between education in the home and preeminent leadership in the children. Many of these fathers assisted personally to a large extent in the education of their children, among whom may be mentioned John Adams, the Reverend Louis Agassiz, Peter Bryant, Jonathan Edwards, John Henry, Abiel Holmes, and so on through the alphabet.

Social Status of Fathers.

This is a loose term, much more so in the Americas than in the older countries. Since social stratification has played a large part in European history, it seemed worth while to list the families on this point. The author runs the risk of winning to himself the opprobrium of the descendants of some of these Makers of America, should his lists be pried into too intimately. He found, however, on studying this subject a surprisingly high social background on the part of the parents of these famous Americans in New England as well as at the South.

The classification brings the following result,—thirty-five fathers of high social status, twenty middle and eight low. At the risk suggested above, a few examples must be given of how these figures were reached. Recent studies into life at Sulgrave leave no doubt for example that the male ancestors of George Washington were men of high social status, allied with several of the great houses of England. The same can be said of the Lees, the Hamiltons, the Virginia Henrys, and probably the Clays. A little question seems to arise in the case of Peter, the father of Jefferson, yet the fact that he was a successful Virginia planter of sufficient standing to meet and marry Jane Randolph seems to answer the question.

Of the southern group there were some, like Andrew Jackson, who seem clearly enough to fall into the middle class,—his parents of plain Scotch-Irish origin. Yet the fact that they planned to prepare him for the ministry (with a few other indications) tend to place him as middle rather than lower class.

Of those at the North there is of course immediately a considerable group who must be ranked as distinctly middle class,—plain farming people who made no social pretenses, like the Harts, Emma Willard's father, or the family of Mark Hopkins, or Alice Freeman's father, who was a small farmer until after his marriage, when he began a brief course of study to become a country physician. Yet on close examination one finds many of the New England representatives of evident culture and able to trace their lineage in a few short generations back to excellent English families and high social status.

If one follows David Starr Jordan, it would seem that all of us could trace our ancestry in one line or another back to royalty.¹⁰ But an examination of the social status of the New England group shows almost as high an average social status as do those of the South. Among the New Englanders whose line held high social position on one or both sides of the Atlantic, also one or both sides of the house, may be listed Emerson, Longfellow, Hawthorne, Peabody, Phillips Brooks, Jonathan Edwards, Lowell, Eli Whitney and Channing.

L. A. 231

Of the eight fathers who were classed as of low social status, possibly a fuller knowledge of the situation in which the fathers spent their early days would serve to raise their ranking. But after making due allowance for frontier conditions, one could hardly place Thomas Lincoln anywhere but on the lower social rung. Jean Audubon, the French fisher lad, who (perhaps of the best Norman blood) became an Admiral of the French Navy and the father of the naturalist, is thus classed also, as are Bernard St. Gaudens, the wandering shoemaker, and the fathers of Eads and Howe.

Success of Fathers.

The success of the fathers, beyond the moderate success which provides a home and assists in educating the children, does not seem to have any bearing on the success of the children, either negative or positive. The dictum that famous men do not have famous or successful children, is dispelled by a few cases as those of John and John Quincy Adams, both presidents of the United States; Lyman Beecher, his son, Henry Ward Beecher, and his daughter, Harriet Beecher Stowe. Equally strong examples of unsuccessful fathers are to be found in the cases of Eads, Clemens, Hamilton and Lincoln. Still another considerable group lost their fathers by death in early childhood. Perhaps the best use of this material may be made by a running comparison between success, education and religion.

Thirty-one of the fathers are classed as eminently successful, 20 as moderately successful, 8 as of small success, (possibly 10) and 4 not sufficient information. Of the 31 successful fathers, 16 went to college, and were notably religious, 11 did not go to college and were notably religious, 3 did not go to college, and were not notably religious, 1 went to college and his religious factor is unknown. Of the 20 moderately successful, 1 went to college and was notably religious, 16 did not go to college and were notably religious, 3 were not college men, and were not religious. Of those that were classed as un-

successful, 1 went to college, and was religious, but seems to have had his spirit broken by an over domineering father (Kent), 4 were not noticeably religious, and did not go to college, 3 did not go to college, but were noticeably religious. What has been proven by this laborious calculation? Perhaps nothing at all. Perhaps it has served to draw a little clearer the lines of connection between higher education, religion, success, parenthood, and the future quality of citizenship.

Religion of Fathers.

In the preceding paragraph reference has already been made to the relation between the religion, the education, and the success of the fathers. Further reference to this subject will also be found under the caption, "Type of Religion in the Church Attended During Childhood."

Here we note that 32 of the fathers belonged to the Puritan group of Congregational and Presbyterian Churches. There were 8 Episcopalians, 4 Unitarians, 3 Baptists, 3 Quakers, 1 Roman Catholic, one Mason (St. Gaudens, of French Roman Catholic origin) who admitted no other religious connection, and ten about whom the information is lacking. As has already been noted eleven were ministers, all of whom ranked rather high in their calling. Of the forty-two non-ministerial fathers about whom there is any information as to their religious attitude, the vast majority were elders, or deacons, or vestrymen, or took some distinctive place in church life—like William Cooper, the father of Fenimore Cooper, who, coming from Quaker stock, became a churchman, built a church, and was a vestryman, or Dr. Freeman, father of Alice, who had daily prayers, and took the family to the church every time the doors were opened; much the same attitude being found in the case of John Adams, of the father of Frances Willard, of Archibald Hopkins, and of others like Moses Gray, father of Asa, Josiah Franklin, or Samuel Hart, father of Emma Willard.

Of the ten marked insufficient information, certainly some belong in the plus column religiously, but probably the

majority had little religious connection. None are known to have openly opposed the church, with the possible exception of St. Gaudens, but doubtless there were some who had little use for organized religion.

Comparison of Religious Affiliations.

While exact figures are not available for a comparison of the religious affiliations of the fathers with the religious situation throughout the country, we may gain some knowledge by comparing the denominational groups with each other. In such a comparison we find that, of the distinctly religious fathers about whose religious attitudes and practises sufficient data are available for the purpose,

the Puritans with an expectation of 31%	had 61%
the Baptists with an expectation of 18%	had 6%
the Episcopalians with an expectation of 9%	had 15%
the Quakers with an expectation of 1½%	had 6%

There is a close relation here between those groups that had a high index of achievement and those groups that promoted as a part of their system of organized religion schools for popular, and colleges for higher, education. There is a like relationship between achievement and those groups which emphasized discipline and self-control—commonly alluded to as Puritanical.

It is difficult to devise a satisfactory basis for statistical comparison of the religious behavior of the fathers with that of the country at large. Attention is called to the fact that the average of church membership for the whole population for the whole period is approximately 12%; yet at least 60% of these fathers were active in organized religion, while 17½% of the fathers were drawn from that small group of Protestant ministers.

Character of Fathers.

The figures give forty-nine excellent, seven medium, three poor, and four no information. The forty-nine include all

those marked as college men, and all those as actively religious. Of course the information is in a good many cases a little scant, but at least the forty-nine were good citizens, good fathers, and supported their families. In the seven only moderate, are included Jesse Grant, who was selfish, vain, and domineering; James Hamilton, who seems to have been weak, careless and inefficient; and the father of James B. Eads, who was undependable, lazy and did little to support the family. Admiral Audubon who brought an illegitimate child home to his wife to rear and is known to have had affinities in several foreign ports, ranks as poor; while David Poe, if unfortunate, was at the same time unstable and hardly desirable as a father.

Summary

A composite picture of the fathers of these famous Americans is that of a man of good physique, sober and industrious, of medium or above medium social position, born in narrow economic circumstances, moderately successful and sparing in the use of money, a believer in discipline and self-control. The most outstanding characteristics are education and religion out of all comparison with the average. The influence of the father is second only to that of the mother, which is in most cases paramount. Where the father died when the child was young his influence seems not to have been lessened, as there was a still closer attachment to a widowed mother, with the addition of the father's memory carried on as a tradition, a symbol, and an ideal.¹¹

¹ Exact figures are of course not procurable, as statistics were scarcely kept at all before 1850. In the early colonies ministers seem to have slightly outnumbered medical men. Later the output of the medical and law schools considerably exceeds that of divinity schools. Shewmaker, William Orpheus, *The Training of the Protestant Ministry in the United States of America*, in *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, Second Series, Vol. VI, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921, p. 187, ff. gives valuable material on the standard of training for the ministry in comparison with that for other professions.

He shows that standards for ministerial training were considerably in advance both chronologically and educationally, of those for law and medicine. These early scholastic requirements for the ministry may have in turn affected the achievements of ministers' sons.

² The Reverend Daniel Dorchester, D. D., mentions by name a long list of ministers in New England who educated in their homes from thirty to one hundred students for the ministry each. He intimates that in addition they also had students in preparation for other professions. Dorchester, Daniel, *Christianity in the United States*, p. 251. See also Palmer, George H., *The Life of Alice Freeman Palmer*, p. 34ff., where the minister of the Presbyterian church was also principal of the Academy, and had as his assistant a young theologian from Princeton.

³ Fields, Annie, *Harriet Beecher Stowe, Life and Letters*, p. 2ff.

⁴ Underwood, F. H., *John Greenleaf Whittier*, p. 56. "There were about twenty volumes in the house, mostly journals and memoirs of pioneers in the religious society,"—i.e. religious biographies.

⁵ Morgan, George, *Patrick Henry*, p. 22ff. "He knew his Horace better than his Bible," but he knew his Bible sufficiently to quote from the Greek testament.

⁶ Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 39. The current impression, which probably arose from political opponents such as Jefferson, that Henry was slothful, careless and incompetent in business, is belied by the well-kept account books of this first youthful business venture, which still exist. The Henry boys were inexperienced and their business troubles came from granting credit to unworthy customers who refused to pay their bills.

⁷ Morgan, *op. cit.* p. 57ff.

⁸ Rossiter, Raymond, *Peter Cooper*, p. 11ff.

⁹ Dorchester, Daniel, *op. cit.*, p. 250ff.

¹⁰ Jordan and Kimball, *Your Family Tree*.

¹¹ Maurice, Major General Sir Frederick, *Robert E. Lee, The Soldier*, p. 5. "The child, therefore, owed little to the personal counsels of his father, but it is not unusual to find that the influence of a distinguished and dead parent, especially when transmitted through a devoted woman, is greater than that of a living father."

CHAPTER II.

MOTHERS OF FAMOUS AMERICANS

Mothers of Famous Americans

Table

<i>Education</i>		<i>Social Status</i>		<i>Religion</i>	
Excellent	16	High	35	Puritan	30
Moderate	19	Middle	18	Episcopalian	12
Limited	13	Low	3	Unitarian	4
No information	15	No information	7	Baptist	3
				Quaker	4
				Roman Catholic	2
				Methodist	1
				No information	7
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
63		63		63	

Descriptive Terms Applied to Character

Parents' Relation to Each Other

Devoted	9	Very devoted	21
Firm—Gentle	17	Devoted	16
Cheerful and energetic	5	Moderately attentive	2
Pleasure loving	3	Overbearing and submissive	2
Pious	3	Some bickering	2
Severe	3	No information	20
Noble	2		
Sensitive	2		
Spiritual	2		
Beautiful	1		
Patient	1		
Prudent	1		
Sympathetic	1		
Temperamental	1		
No information	12		
<hr/>		<hr/>	
63		63	

Mothers of Famous Americans

Criteria

UNLESS otherwise stated the criteria for classifying mothers are the same as those used for the fathers. In the matter of occupation no classification is necessary, for the reasons given in the succeeding paragraphs. In social status and religion the same rules as for the fathers apply. In education a distinctly different situation is to be found. "Higher" education in the form of colleges for women being entirely unknown in the period of the girlhood of all the mothers under consideration, no collegiate standard can be set up. The matter is discussed *in situ*. Here it is sufficient to state that where a woman had, in addition to a knowledge from practical experience of the varied and complicated duties of a Colonial household, training in two higher branches, such as Music, French, Theology, Mathematics or the Classics, her education is classed as excellent. Those whose education included the household duties and the three R's, are classed as moderate. Those who could either not read and write or could barely do so and had had no experience of keeping a large and elaborate household are classed as limited.

As regards criteria for the character of the mothers, no very illuminating distinctions have been developed. There are in the main two classes,—those whose lives are known and those who are not known. An attempt will be made to apply the criteria for the character for the fathers, also perhaps more to the point,—there is a classification on the basis of being indulgent, or firm but understanding, or overstrict. But the devotion, sacrifice and deep understanding of practically all the mothers defies classification.

Occupation of Mothers.

Despite the great importance of his mother in a man's life, we find biographical material on the maternal side more

scanty than on the paternal. Professional occupations for women are in general a recent development, a development brought about in fact by some of the women here studied. It is taken for granted that the mothers' occupations were those of housewife and mother. There is but one exception in the entire list, the mother of Poe, who was an actress. In the homes from which the greatest sons and daughters have come whether poor or rich, being a mother was a full time occupation.

Education of Mothers.

It is a little difficult to measure the education of women as compared with that of men. Before 1820 general higher education for women was scarcely dreamed of, and it was such women as Emma Hart Willard and Mary Lyon who showed its desirability as well as proved its possibility. Yet despite the backwardness of women's education, the education of the mothers of these sixty-three famous Americans must be classed as excellent 16, moderate 19, limited 13, unknown 15, as against 28 excellent for the fathers and only one unknown. And further, so far as formal or classical education was concerned, the sixteen classed as excellent had had limited opportunities, and none, so far as the records show, had graduated from any college. On the other hand none are known to be illiterate, and these sixteen managed to secure an excellent education for the times and purposes in view. For let it be remembered that the tin can had not then been invented, prepared breakfast foods were still beyond the horizon, and when in need of supplies one went to the store room and the smoke house instead of the delicatessen or the red front grocery.

There was much to learn by doing, in carding, spinning, weaving, dyeing, dressmaking; raising, preparing and preserving all sorts of food; making soap and candles, and the hundred and one other occupations of the busy housewife, even of the towns, until after the period of the Civil War. All this was a part of the social heritage, built by long centuries

into the fabric of life, and it was for this reason that a substantial middle class was fitted to flourish in the American colonies. The sixteen mothers who are adjudged excellent and the nineteen moderate all had much of this practical home education, but the sixteen were in addition sufficiently surrounded with cultural influences to have mastered each at least two of the following branches, Music, French, English Literature, Theology or the Classics. A few examples are Ruth Haskins, the mother of Emerson, whose stories, bed-time songs, and reading aloud largely formed the tastes of her talented son; this may also be said of Sarah Wendell, mother of Oliver Wendell Holmes, of Zilpah Wadsworth, mother of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and very especially of the mother of James Russell Lowell.¹ The mothers of the Boston group probably had more formal education than the mothers of the Southern group, but Mary Ball, the mother of George Washington, by experience and by reading, became a woman of good education, though a poor speller. Many of the Southern mothers are classed as unknown educationally, simply for lack of attention on the part of biographers.

Social Status of Mothers.

The records of Social Status for the mothers show, high 35, middle 18, low 3, unknown 7, as against 35, 20 and 8 for the fathers. Further comment here is hardly necessary, except possibly that there is a slight tendency for women of an older and maturer cultural background to marry men of energy and force but less social training.

Religion of Mothers.

In the field of Religion the mothers rank particularly high. They are listed as: Puritan or Presbyterian, 30; Episcopalian 12; Unitarian 4; Baptist 3; Quaker 4; Roman Catholic 2; Methodist 1; no information 7. This parallels closely the religious affiliations of the fathers, except that 32, 2 more fathers, were of the Puritan persuasion. On closer examination

it is found that not a few "married out of meeting," and that the children seem to have benefited by minor, religious hybridization.² Interesting examples of this are the Irvings. Washington Irving's father was a strict Calvinist, his mother left the Episcopal Church to follow her husband's faith—but young Washington Irving was confirmed by the Episcopal bishop in order to escape being a Presbyterian. William Cooper of Cooperstown was a Quaker, but became an Episcopalian to join his wife, Elizabeth Fenimore; the Whittiers seem to have been Congregationalists with Quaker leanings, and John Whittier became a Quaker, the faith of Abigail Hussey, his wife. Hamilton's father was Scotch Presbyterian, his mother French Huguenot. Roxana Foote, the mother of Harriet and Henry Ward Beecher was brought up and confirmed in the Episcopal church, but became a Presbyterian on marrying Lyman Beecher, a Presbyterian minister.³ An interesting, and for this study important fact that has emerged, is that of the total 63, there are 48 mothers listed as devout, one or both parent is reported as devout in 58 cases, and 4 are listed as of insufficient information as regards either parent. This will be more fully discussed in a subsequent section, under the title, "Parents of Famous Americans." The most outstanding characteristic of the mothers is their deep devotion to God and to their children.

Character of Mothers.

As an example of the varied terms used by biographers in describing their subjects, the character of the mothers has been listed under 16 different headings, rather than to compress them immediately into three or four categories,—a process which has had to be followed more or less continuously throughout these studies. Nine are described as "devoted" mothers, seventeen as firm but gentle, or an analogous phrase, five as energetic, and the remainder one, two or three each, as pious, pleasure loving, severe, noble, sensitive, spiritual, patient, prudent, etc., twelve no information. But no mere

list of adjectives and adverbs can rightly convey this ever recurring picture of love, labor and solicitous tenderness which these biographies bring out as the outstanding characteristics of the mothers of great men and women,—the mother of George Washington, left a widow, managing a plantation, a horde of servants and a crowd of unruly boys, yet finding time for her quiet devotions and to instruct the household in religion, ethics and conduct, in later years spending daily hours in prayer while her son fought for freedom; the mother of Henry Clay, the parson's widow, struggling to hold together the ragged strands of her inheritance, and having everything of value carried off or destroyed by the invading British soldiers; Daniel Boone's Quaker mother, ignorant to be sure, but teaching him what she knew, tending the cattle, and the winter stores of food while the men fought off the Indians and subdued the wilderness; Alice Freeman's mother, running the farm and caring for her three little girls, while her husband secured his education; Mary Lyon's mother, struggling to keep a roof over her children's heads, and wood to warm them through the cold New England winter, yet trudging with them, but poorly clad, through the snow to the country church, and always finding something to share with those she thought poorer than she. These are cases taken almost at random, yet everywhere a picture of beauty, love and devotion.

Parents of Famous Americans.

A subject of some importance is that of Parents of Famous Americans, taken together. In their relation to each other, twenty-one are listed as very devoted, sixteen as devoted (the difference chiefly in the temperament and diction of the biographer), two as moderately attached, two husband overbearing and wife submissive; in two cases some bickering is indicated, and in twenty unfortunately there is little or no information available, but no reason to believe that the relationships were any less harmonious than in the cases noted.

Scandal, broken homes, separation and divorce were almost unknown to them. The point to be noted here is that these leaders and benefactors came from the kind of homes where people did not want to get a divorce, and that they were the children of parents who for the most part gave no offense that would make a divorce desirable or severe bickering possible. The simple fact is that these parents loved each other. Love is not news; a scandal is, so that it is hard to bring out the picture by illustrations. One simply has to state the fact.

No Divorce Among Parents.

Of distinct conjugal infelicity not a single case among the parents is to be found nor any case of divorce, except as follows. Rachel Fawcette, Alexander Hamilton's mother, daughter of a French Huguenot physician, was forced into an undesirable marriage for the sake of money by an ambitious mother, with an old man, a Jewish merchant. The situation was impossible, and Rachel soon returned home. Laws were stringent, and out of jealousy her husband, who had deserted her and removed to Belgium, refused a divorce. Rachel and James Hamilton, a young man of the Scotch nobility, fell in love with each other and lived together as man and wife, without the sanction of church and state, but with deep devotion and affection, during the brief years of her life.⁴ Again, Admiral Audubon brought to his wife his illegitimate son, John James, born in Santo Domingo. The wife, who had no children of her own, seems to have raised no serious objection, and during her life lavished much care and wealth upon the boy. St. Gaudens and his wife seem to have been an ill-mated pair, he French, she Irish, he anti-church, she a devout Roman Catholic, he erratic and self-opinionated, she submissive, but stubborn. Yet even here there was affection, and never an intimation of a break. That there were minor difficulties in many, if not all the marriages, is to be taken for granted, but these three or four families present all that comes to the surface apart from a devoted and successful married life.

Second Marriages.

With the large families and the poor medical service of the times, many mothers died in childbirth, or as a result thereof. In such cases the father as a rule married again, and not infrequently had a second brood of children. Less frequently in the cases studied the mother, like Widow Clay, married the second time. Stepmothers may in actual life live up to their reputation. If so, such families do not produce timber for the Hall of Fame. Two interesting and typical examples are those of the Lyman Beechers, and the family of Elisha Story. Harriet and Henry Ward were the youngest of the nine little Beechers when their mother, Roxana Foote, died,—a most devoted and beloved mother. A year or so later Dr. Beecher brought his second wife to rule the home. The new mother came with the utmost tact, and took hold of the unruly crowd of seven boys with loving devotion. She soon won their confidence and eventually their love, and the order and system that she put into that talented family had much to do with their ultimate success.⁵ A less well known but equally beautiful picture is that of Mehitable Pedrick, who became the second wife of Dr. Elisha Story of Marblehead. She inherited the seven children of Ruth Ruddock, to which she added, from time to time, eleven of her own, of which eleven Joseph, the Jurist, was the eldest. This vast household seem to have loved her without distinction, and she them; and when they got together she, always vivacious, enthusiastic, romantic, was the life of the party, full of jesting and practical jokes. Yet she was at the same time devout and devoted to the church of which her own brother was pastor.

Overbearing Father.

The two cases where the father was particularly overbearing and the wife notably submissive, are those of the Hawthornes and the Grants. Nathaniel Hawthorne, Sr., is said to have been "the sternest captain that ever walked a deck"—to

a degree almost pathological. Possibly knowledge of the witches' curses upon the family may have adversely affected the family temperament. His wife, Elizabeth Manning, was high strung, nervous, and introspective. Yet whatever may have been the Captain's fault of carrying his severity into his home, the wife seems from all accounts to have deeply revered his memory and to have practically retired from society for the remainder of her life upon his death.⁶

Jesse Grant was also of an extremely domineering disposition and seems to have broken the spirit of both his wife and his son Ulysses. Hawthorne's father died when the lad was quite young and his influence was largely at second hand; Ulysses Grant was a brainy but cowed individual, with an inferiority complex, who was trying desperately to prove to himself, and more particularly to his wife in later years, that he was neither a coward nor a failure. This in Grant may be attributed to the experiences of his childhood, in relationship with his father and his mother.⁷

Religion of the Parents.

Turning now to the religion of the parents, there is positive information of thirty-nine fathers who were religious or devout, and of fifty-one mothers. The quality of the religion of the parents, of course, varied greatly, and its defects, such as fear and over sternness, may be reflected in the lack of mental adjustment of the children. In fifty-eight cases one or both parents was distinctly religious; in one case only, the unhappy case of the Poes, does the evidence seem directly negative. This leaves four cases where the evidence is inconclusive—Audubon, Farragut, Hamilton and Howe. Audubon may be put in the negative—the illegitimate child of a self-made Admiral and a coquette of Santo Domingo. The evidence is quite the contrary in the case of Farragut, though inconclusive, and Admiral Farragut was himself of a distinctly devout nature.⁸ Of Alexander Hamilton it is known that he was sent to school to the Scotch minister by his father, and

that his maternal grandfather was a refugee for the sake of his faith—a French Huguenot. Howe's youth is practically lost in poverty and obscurity. On the positive side this list of fifty-eight out of sixty-three sets of parents one or both of whom were distinctly devout is one of the most impressive findings of the study. Three of the four doubtful cases were of non-Anglo Saxon or mixed foreign parentage.

¹ Green, David Haskins, *Ralph Waldo Emerson, His Maternal Ancestors*, p. 48ff. Morse, John T. Jr., *Oliver Wendell Holmes*, vol. I, p. 10.

² The slight gap between two Protestant sects was easily bridged, with increased breadth for the child, and seemingly good results. A mixed Roman Catholic-Protestant experience was less successful,—viz., General Sherman, a son of a Puritan home, brought up by Roman Catholic foster-parents.

³ All of these cases are adequately treated in the biographical sketches, from which references may be had to the literary sources, shortly to be published by the writer.

⁴ The paternity of Alexander Hamilton becomes more of a mystery, the more one pries into the records. Hamilton states that his father went out of his life "at an early age." The indications are that his father was still living, and that there was some animosity; its cause, however, is not disclosed. See Lodge, Henry C., *Alexander Hamilton*, appendix, p. 285ff.

⁵ Fields, Annie, *Harriet Beecher Stowe*, p. 27ff.

⁶ Hawthorne, Julian, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, p. 5ff.

⁷ King, General Charles, *The True Ulysses S. Grant*, p. 31.

⁸ Farragut came under strong religious influence from his foster father, Admiral Porter, and his tutor, who was a Chaplain in the Navy.

CHAPTER III.

ANCESTORS OF FAMOUS AMERICANS

Grandparents of Famous Americans

Information Concerning

	<i>Paternal Grandfather</i>	<i>Maternal Grandfather</i>	<i>Paternal Grandmother</i>	<i>Maternal Grandmother</i>
Full	28=44%	24=40%	14=22%	10=15%
Little	17=27%	19=30%	13=21%	14=22%
None	18=29%	20=30%	36=57%	39=63%

Birthplace of Famous Americans

By States and Countries

Massachusetts	26
New York	7
Virginia	7
Connecticut	4
Ohio	2
Pennsylvania	2
Rhode Island	2
Indiana	1
Kentucky	1
Louisiana	1
Maine	1
Missouri	1
New Hampshire	1
New Jersey	1
South Carolina	1
Tennessee	1
England	1
Ireland	1
Switzerland	1
West Indies	1
Total	63

By Regions

<i>New England</i>	
Massachusetts	26
Connecticut	4
Rhode Island	2
Maine	1
New Hampshire	1
Total	34
<i>Middle Atlantic</i>	
New York	7
New Jersey	1
Pennsylvania	2
Total	10
<i>South Atlantic</i>	
Virginia	7
South Carolina	1
Total	8
<i>Western</i>	
Foreign	4
Total	63

Predominant Ancestral Race Stock

1. English	43
2. Scotch or Scotch Irish	7
3. English and Scotch	7
4. French Huguenot (Agassiz)	1
5. Scotch and French (Hamilton)	1
6. Spanish and English (Farragut)	1
7. Irish (Eads)	1
8. French and Irish (St. Gaudens)	1
9. French and Spanish (Audubon)	1
	—
	63

Occupations by Race Groups

<i>English Middle Class</i>		<i>English Upper Class</i>	
Lawyer and, or, Statesman	7	Lawyer Statesman	5
Minister	4	Warrior Statesman	1
Historian	3	Warrior	1
Poet-author	5	Poet-author	4
Teacher	4		—
Inventor	3		11
Frontiersman	1	<i>English Scotch</i>	
Actor	1	Author	3
Scientist	2	Artist	1
Philanthropist	2	Minister	1
	—	Philanthropist	1
	32	Warrior	1
			—
<i>Scotch and Scotch Irish</i>			7
Scientists	3	<i>Scattering</i>	
Warriors	2	1 each, artist, engineer, law-	
Teacher	1	yer, scientist, scientist-artist,	
Inventor-artist	1	warrior	6
	—		—
	7		63

Order of Birth in the Family

Eldest child	15
A middle child	34
Youngest child	5
Only child	1
No information	8
	—
Total	63

Note: Joseph Story was the eldest of eleven children by the second wife! There were seven children by the first wife. He is here registered as the eldest, because of the treatment he received from both his parents.

Note: Emma Willard was the sixteenth of seventeen children.

Distinguished Relatives of Famous Americans

1. Number having distinguished relative listed	40
2. No distinguished relatives mentioned	23
	—
	63
3. Related to each other through the Boston Puritan Stock	15
4. Probable like relationship	5
	—
	20
5. Number whose distinguished relative is in the same field or profession	19
6. Distinguished relatives mainly different field	19
7. Distinguished relatives in similar field	2
	—
	40

Grandparents of Famous Americans

THE information concerning the grandparents of famous Americans must be set out in tabular form in order to show its significance.

Information Concerning

	<i>Paternal Grandfather</i>	<i>Maternal Grandfather</i>	<i>Paternal Grandmother</i>	<i>Maternal Grandmother</i>
Full	28=44%	24=40%	14=22%	10=15%
Little	17=27%	19=30%	13=21%	14=22%
None	18=29%	20=30%	36=57%	39=63%

A casual glance at the table will show that it has a definite slant from the upper left toward the lower right side—that starting with full information regarding fathers' father in the case of 44%, we have mothers' father 40%, fathers' mother 22%, and mothers' mother 15%. Information which is full in the straight male line is constantly less and less as we approach the full female line. For biological purposes the study of one line seems to be of equal value with that of any other line. For the study of social heredity the direct female line is of greater importance. For the woman is the housewife; she does the housekeeping; she sets the habits and customs of the household; she in particular cares for the children when they are small and impressionable. But she had her training in her mother's home, and those habits and customs which are taught to the children are to be traced back through the mother's mother's mother, with only minor modifications from the side of the male social heredity. Will biographers who may chance to see these lines please note!

The questions asked concerning grandparents were their occupations, success, social status, religion, and character.

The returns were rather scanty and not of great value, unless research for filling up gaps should be pursued beyond hope of commensurate returns. A set of these forms tried on a group of Summer School students, teachers and Sunday School teachers, brought about the same returns, with diminishing results towards the mother's mother and very sketchy knowledge of any grandparents.

The information secured concerning grandparents of the sixty-three persons on our list tended to show:

1. The great importance of social heredity, i.e., the passing on of family customs and habits of religion, morals, education and social life especially through the mother.
2. That though in marriage the men and women generally kept fairly to their own level, there was a steady up curve in social and economic status, due perhaps to the conditions of a new country, with increased liberty, enlarged opportunity and improved economic conditions generally.
3. That there was a corresponding liberalizing in theology and in social customs (as restricted by the church) but no general departure from religion itself, either personal or organized.

Predominant Ancestral Race Stock.

One's ancestral strain spreads out rapidly like a fan, with geometrical progression. The fact that one individual of this generation would have from one hundred to five hundred million ancestors of the time of William the Conqueror (thirty to thirty-three generations) makes the tracing of ancestry to any great antiquity seem rather futile; yet a summary of the immediate derivation of these famous Americans may be of value. In most cases it has been possible to trace them to a comparatively stable equilibrium on the other side of the Atlantic, with the following results:

English Middle Class	32
English Upper Class	11

Scotch and Scotch Irish	7
English and Scotch	7
French Huguenot	1
Scotch and French	1
Spanish and English	1
Irish Roman Catholic	1
French and Irish	1
French and Spanish	1

 63

It is thus seen that 57 of the 63 were of straight British Protestant families. The remaining 6 were scattering, 3 of them Protestant, 4 of them at least partly British, (Hamilton, Farragut, Eads, St. Gaudens) and only 2 (Agassiz, Audubon) entirely non British. Since the original calculation, as further information has come in, one would tend to raise rather than lower the estimate of the social class from which the English group come. For example, though Dr. Lyman Beecher's father was a blacksmith, Harriet and Henry's lines led in a few generations into the great families of England (Earl of Bridgewater, Duke of Norfolk, etc., thence to Henry I of France and Anne of Russia.)¹ It is of course seen immediately that with 43 out of 63 straight English, and 8 partly so, they predominate to an astonishing degree. On the other hand little Scotland is well represented, with 15 entirely or partly of Scotch origin.

Occupation by Race Groups.

The tables of occupations by race groups are too long to quote here, and do not apparently have any great significance. Practically all of the statesmen, lawyers and ministers are of straight English descent; those with Scotch blood run more proportionally to science, art and literature; while those of mixed and scattering origin are completely scattered among the professions.

Birthplace by Countries, States and Regions.

The birthplace of these Americans is Massachusetts 26, New York and Virginia 7 each, Connecticut 4, 2 each in Rhode

Island, Pennsylvania and Ohio, and the rest one each in various states and 4 foreign countries. Regrouping them by regions, there are from New England 34, the Middle Atlantic States 10, South Atlantic States 8, "The West" 7, and Foreign 4.

Upon calling the roll it is found that the Virginia and South Atlantic groups are all statesmen, descended from English or English and Scotch ancestry—Washington, Madison, Jefferson, Marshall, Patrick Henry, Henry Clay, excepting only Robert E. Lee, who came of a largely statesman-military family.

The New England group have provided leaders for every field of endeavor. They include almost as many statesmen and jurists as Virginia. They include also all the ministers and historians, and a large part of the literary men, as well as scientists, inventors, artists, all except military leaders, which are notably lacking. A further examination shows that they were largely from in and around Boston, all but two or three descended from English Puritan stock. Many of them are known to be inter-related, and probably many more are. The group include the Adams, Bancroft, the Beechers, Brooks, Bryant, Channing, Choate, Charlotte Cushman, Edwards, Emerson, Franklin, Hawthorne, Holmes, Mark Hopkkins, Elias Howe, Kent, Longfellow, Lowell, Mary Lyon, Horace Mann, Maria Mitchell, Morse, Motley, Morton, Parkman, Peabody, Poe (not by ancestry, almost by chance), Story, Stuart, Webster, Whitney, Whittier and Emma Willard. It would seem that the strict discipline of the New England Puritan home, which so generally resulted in self discipline and industry in one's affairs, and which is so generally criticised today, is worthy of further and careful consideration.²

Order of Birth in the Family.

A good deal of time has been spent by certain investigators, probably to little purpose, discussing whether the eldest or the youngest child has the better chance of notable attainments. As it involved little extra labor, the available material has

been tabulated, as follows: eldest child 15; a middle child 34; youngest child 5; only child 1; no information 8. Allowing for an average of $7\frac{1}{2}$ children per family in the 54 families of record, one should expect 7 eldest, and 7 for each of the succeeding places. Eliminating the one only child, which might be counted both ways, it is found that the eldest had more than twice the expected quota, and the youngest slightly under the quota. Training and early responsibility are likely causes, rather than biological reasons.

It should be noted that the record family was 18 children, 2 had 17, and 11 was a popular number. Emma Willard was the sixteenth of seventeen children, and in several instances very brilliant children came near the end of a long list, Benjamin Franklin being the fifteenth of seventeen.

Distinguished Relatives.

This is not a study in heredity and genealogy. Such facts regarding distinguished relatives as were readily available were recorded as pertinent, but a separate study with carefully chosen criteria of relationship would have to be made, and would require a vast amount of research, in order to be conclusive. In 40 of the 63 cases one or more distinguished relative is mentioned in the biographies. The major fact that came out was that of the New England group in the Hall of Fame list, 15 are inter-related. Ancestral names mentioned made it appear that an additional 5 were also inter-related. No definite degrees of relationship were set as a limit, except that it should be on this side of the Atlantic. Inter-relationship among members of the Southern group is also possible, but with the exception of two or three probable cases no data were discovered to indicate such relationship, either there or elsewhere in the country outside of New England.

¹ Jordan, David Starr, and Kimball, Sarah Louise, *Your Family Tree*, New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1929, p. 265ff. Dr. Jordan there shows that Deacon Edmond Rice was a descendant of Henry I of France, of the Dukes of Norfolk,

of Lady Catherine Howard, and other royal personages. From such a connection one immediately gets into a vast network of royal relationships. Descendants of Deacon Rice in America mentioned by Dr. Jordan are John Quincy Adams, Samuel F. B. Morse, Mary Baker Eddy, Clara Barton, Julia Ward Howe, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Henry Ward Beecher and Harriet Hosmer.

² The population of New England at the close of the Colonial period (1775) is given as 700,000; the Middle Atlantic Colonies, 765,000; the South Atlantic Colonies, 675,000. See appendix, p. 5.

CHAPTER IV.

DOMINANT INFLUENCES ON FAMOUS
AMERICANS

Predominant Influence on Famous Americans

Good relationship with Father	38
Not particularly good	8
No information	5
Father died early	12
	42
	63
Good relationship with Mother	48
Not particularly good	3
No information	6
Mother died early	6
	—
	63
Specially close relation with father,—predominant influence	25
Specially close relation with mother,—predominant influence	38
Of the above, duplicates	20
Got on well with brothers and/or sisters	32
Not well with brothers 3 + 5	8
Well with sisters but not brothers	5
Stepfathers—both very kind and helpful	2
Stepmothers—(friendly and helpful, 4; 1 not)	5
Those who had a very deep influence, others than Father or Mother:	
Teachers	22
Older friends	7
Aunts	3
Uncles	4
Adopted fathers	3
Wives	3
Pastors (who were not father nor mother)	3
Grandfather	1
Stepfather	1
Stepmother	3
Sisters	2
Sister-in-law	1
Brother	1
	—
	47

Predominant Influence on Famous Americans

Criteria

IN rating the dominant personal influence on the subjects, a different angle of the problem, in regard to criteria, is encountered from the relationships previously considered. It would at first seem a simple matter to draw up specifications for a dominant and subdominant personal influence in the development of an individual. But the theoretical treatment which was first given to the subject met unexpected complications. The complications arise from the fact that parents were sometimes also ministers, or teachers, that there were parents who died young, where memory was a potent symbol and ideal, that there were step-parents and adopted parents; again what is meant by a predominant influence,—one that leads to a major choice in life work or profession, or a continual daily presence which molds character, and makes a given type of choice possible? Further, how can one tell in a given case whether the influence of a parent is greater than that of a teacher, minister, or friend, which is of such a different order? Upon consideration of the total situation, it appeared that the normal parental relationship, where one or both parents lived throughout the subject's childhood and youth, by reason of its closeness, its continuity, its authority, and its affection, is so infinitely greater in the aggregate than that of any other personal relationship, that the field of predominant personal influence must be granted to parents. Granting that parents, one or both, came first in influence in normal family life,—it remained simply to list and count others who had a notable influence, classifying them according to the type of relationship which brought them into touch with the subject. The nature of the influence is briefly illustrated by a few examples,

but rating as to quality or intensity of the influence has not been successfully accomplished. The listings were originally made and are being rechecked on the basis of a described relationship in which the subject was influenced not externally in the choice of a career which may even have led to his distinction, rather of fundamental character influence, which would control the type of choices to be made. Admitting that the evidence is spotty and not finally conclusive, it is given for what it is worth.

Relationship of Child with Parents.

Exact criteria for grading the relationship of a child with his parents would be difficult to set up. The relationship is, however, usually described by biographers in some detail, in all biographies in which any details of early life are given, for the reason that the biographer frequently finds in this relationship the turning point in the subject's career. There seemed little reason for, and little possibility of, grading beyond positive and negative. There is no middle ground between helpful devotion and a clash of wills, except the death of the parent concerned. The procedure was simply to grade on this basis, then re-examine for other possible criteria and classifications. Criteria for *getting on well*, were definite examples of mutual affection and cooperation, with sufficient indication that this represented sacrifice and devotion on the part of the parent, with an increasing understanding and appreciation on the part of the child. Criteria for *not getting on well* were at least one example of a crucial disagreement or important misunderstanding, with sufficient indication that this was a definite clash of wills which came as a culmination of persistent misunderstanding.

The material for the relationship between brothers and sisters is less well defined than that dealing with parents and children. Such as it is, it has been treated on the basis of the same criteria as the relationship between father and son. The same may be said of stepfathers and stepmothers.

Relationship with Fathers.

It is to be noted that 39 of the subjects, including 5 of the 7 women, got on particularly well with their fathers; 8 not particularly well; 4 insufficient information; and in 12 cases the father died when the child was too young to have much known direct influence. Of the 8 born in the South Atlantic States, the fathers of 5 died in their childhood; these boys were either orphans, or were brought up by a widowed mother, in either case they had much responsibility thrust early upon them. This condition seems to have been a desirable substitute for the discipline and self-discipline more common at the North.¹ All three of the remaining eight got on extremely well with their fathers,—Madison, Marshall and Patrick Henry. Of Henry there has been some question, owing to the picture of his life given us by William Wirt. More recent biographers, notably George Morgan, depict a sensitive youth, with the soul of an artist, a lover of music, who sought to learn the language of the birds, who as a young merchant gave credit to unworthy neighbors; who grubbed stumps with his own hands to support a lovely young wife; and whose father repeatedly said of him that he was a most dutiful son.² The discipline which his amiable father failed to supply, either as father or tutor and school master, was plentifully provided by a Presbyterian mother, and by the ministrations of the Calvinist divine, the Reverend Samuel Davies, later president of Princeton College.

Of the large group who got on particularly well with their father, one of the outstanding instances is that of Dr. Story of Marblehead and his son; Joseph, eldest of ten children by a second wife. Little Joe was singled out, perhaps by reason of a special responsiveness, by his father as a particular companion and confidant. The father consulted him, encouraged him, put responsibility on him. Writing to his son, William, Joseph Story says, "I was about your age (fourteen) when my father first began to give me his confidence, and to treat me as one entitled to it. He freely conversed with me on all his hopes and

his situation in life, and taught me to feel the importance of firmness, sound morals, and an ambition of excellence. He told me that I should be obliged to depend on my own exertions for my success in life; that he should leave little or no property; and that I must study to fit myself for my profession in life. I never forgot his advice and kindness; it was present to me at all times, and gave a new turn to my thoughts. From that time I began to think that I ought to cease to be a mere boy and to struggle for distinction as a man."³

Here is an example of the kind of relationship that ought to exist between a father and a son. It is a relationship that cannot be established suddenly, for it depends on mutual confidence and understanding which are of slow growth. Something of the same relationship seems to have existed in at least thirty-nine of these cases, though unfortunately it is stated by the individual himself in his own words in but few instances. This relationship evidently led to desirable results; for it played a large part in the life of the distinguished son—Judge of the United States Supreme Court, founder of the Harvard Law School, beloved teacher, and much revered religious leader.

There is available a large amount of valuable illustrative material like that of the Story's, father and son. But few instances can be mentioned. John Quincy Adams traveled about with his distinguished father on diplomatic missions, getting his schooling in both books and diplomacy through association with his father. This led to a diplomatic appointment, as secretary of the legation at Petrograd, then St. Petersburg, at the age of fourteen. Then there is Louis Agassiz' intimate correspondence with his delightful father, who shared his every hope and enthusiasm, yet held him to a practical course; always a measure of disagreement in judgment, bridged by affection and mutual respect.⁴ The historian, George Bancroft, says in a letter to Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, "My father suffered me to go out in all weather; to play in the snow; to meet the extremest cold with scanty preparation for it; . . . In the culture of mind I owe infinitely more to my father. He

never taught his children to believe anything on authority . . . A constant clause in his morning prayer was, 'Give us a teachable temper,' which is just the gift of which we students of biology and history have the most need.'⁵ But why go on through the alphabet? The material is there for those who care to use it. It is of sufficient volume and quality to repay many-fold for the labor of collecting it.

Of salutary influence, yet less pleasant reading, is that which deals with the wrong kind of influence of fathers upon their sons. As potent an example as any is the relationship which existed between Jesse Grant and his son Ulysses. The father was ignorant, vain, pretentious, and domineering. The boy was brilliant, nervous, sensitive, devoted to peace and quiet, a lover of animals and of the out-of-doors. There is sufficient evidence that the boy's spirit was broken by cruel flogging in early childhood. The father secured an appointment for his son to West Point, without consulting the boy in any way, and when Ulysses demurred, his father forced him to go, —in order to have his own way and to save himself the expense of his son's education. It shows lack of fundamental strength of character that the boy was willing to be cowed and driven in that way—that even when away from his father, he made a high second at West Point, though he hated it. Is this the stuff of which generals, heroes, presidents are made? It was later Grant the failure, Grant who had been cowed by fear, who was driven on to success by a greater fear.⁶ Other instances where father and son did not get on well were the Poes, between whom there was "continual jarring and bickering," the Channings, where there was "respect but little room for affection," the Howes, where the son wished to be a mechanic and the father bound him out to a farmer, the Franklins and the Washington Irvings—these two latter domineering, especially in religious matters.

Relation with Mothers.

Turning now to the mothers, it is hardly a surprise to learn that 48 are noted expressly as having got on well with their

mothers, as against 39 with their fathers, and only three are known to have had difficulties with their mothers,—in six cases there is no information, and in six others the mother died too early to have had much direct influence. It is traditional, and one of the established facts of human experience that the relation between mother and child is fundamental and central. The remarkable fact is that three who did not get on well with their mothers could have risen at all to great heights.

The ideal relation of Mary Ball Washington to her boys is too well known to need repeating here. An especially beautiful relationship existed between Robert E. Lee and his mother, Anne Carter. He cared for her as an invalid for years, with a singular tenderness and devotion. She brought him up to revere his father's memory with an almost religious devotion, so that this memory had probably a larger influence on his life than had the father lived. This has its value as a means of character development, it has also its dangers. Lee's father, governor of Virginia, had said, "Virginia is my country. Her will I obey, however lamentable the fate to which it may subject me." It was probably his father's memory and this saying of his that was the turning point in Lee's entering the Confederacy instead of the Union Army . . . Phillips Brooks received his sunny disposition and much of his healthy-minded joyous faith from his mother, and is quoted as saying, "The happiest part of my life has been my mother."

The few sporadic cases where able sons did not get on well with their mothers are traceable in part at least to an over severe type of religion. Instances are to be found in the case of Channing, where the religion is described as "formal, over-strict, justice rather than love," and Horace Mann, who was toward his parents, "obedient, submissive, with little outward affection." This was much relaxed in later years, after he had thrown off the fear of the devil, and both of them had become much humanized.

Particularly to be noted was the success which widows had in training their sons—like the instance of Lee mentioned just

above—to which may be added numerous others such as the Widow Hopkins, Fulton's mother, and Elizabeth Hudson, the widow of John Clay. There are also several additional instances where the lingering memory of a parent who died played a central rôle in a great career, the most dramatic that of Henry Ward Beecher. His mother died when he was three. An older sister found little Henry digging a hole in the garden beneath the parlor window. She asked him what he was doing. He replied that they had put his mother under the ground and he was going to dig and find her. Though he came in time to love his stepmother, he never forgot his own mother, and ever after the thought of her spurred him on and seemed almost to guide his life.⁷

In twelve cases biographers recorded the fathers as the dominant influence in the subject's life, in twenty-two cases the mother was declared dominant, or a chief influence, in eighteen additional cases both parents together, making a total of fifty-two cases out of sixty-three in which one or both parents played a leading part in the son or daughter's career. This leaves but few for the orphan and the unknown.

In thirty-two cases the child got on well with brothers and, or, sisters. Here the information is scanty, and in a number of cases there is little or no reference to brothers and sisters at all. With large families (an average of seven and one-half children per family) the general impression, with the exception of two or three abnormal cases like Poe and the Hawthornes, is of extremely happy homes, filled with exuberant, healthful children, whose spirits were but moderately curbed by parental and religious discipline—young people who had to work for what they got, who soon learned self-discipline in place of that imposed from above. Cases of these happy normal families with devoted brothers and sisters are the Agassizs where the whole family played together, and made scientific expeditions and collections together, the Beechers, the Choates, one big family with an island farm and few other playmates, the Fenimore Coopers, where an elder sister had a fundamental

influence; Phillips Brooks who was devoted to his brothers, went directly home from school, and had little to do with other playmates; Emerson, Emma Hart (Willard) and Frances Willard. Lincoln had one own sister to whom he was devoted; with his brothers, half brothers, and stepbrothers he played and fought alternately,—the tie was not close. Much the same may be said of William T. Sherman and Daniel Boone. Morse and Augustus Saint-Gaudens are said to have been devoted to their brothers, but no sisters are mentioned.

In seven cases a brother is stated not to have got on well with his other brothers; in only one a sister not well with brothers—Charlotte Cushman who says she “lorded it over her brothers”—this would have been passed by as superficial except that in later years she seems to have been devoted to her sister, while her brothers, except the youngest who died, are not mentioned.⁸ But there are five cases where the brother got on well with his sister or sisters but not with his brothers (included in the above seven). It is said that Channing’s brothers tormented him, while he was devoted to his sisters; Franklin was fond of his sisters but quarreled with his brothers, in play and later in business. Somewhat the same is true of Grant; Parkman showed little intimacy with his one brother, but his sisters were devoted to him and did much to help him in his difficult historical work.⁹ The study seems to indicate that desirable characters are produced in normal, happy homes, where brothers and sisters live happily together, and that causes of disagreement more often arise between brother and brother than between a brother and sisters. Sisters are very apt to be helpful and play an important part in a brother’s career, and at the same time to get on well with each other.

Stepfathers and Stepmothers.

Only two stepfathers appear in the list, and both are rated kind and helpful—not many on which to base conclusions. Of 5 stepmothers one only lived up to the traditional reputation; 4 of them were devoted and beloved. To be sure the

Beecher's stepmother is described by a biographer as "over strict" but with such a household and such a husband, what else could she be? She brought order out of chaos, and played a large part in the happiness and success of the family. Lincoln's stepmother also did much for him. Mrs. Audubon may almost be considered as a stepmother, and she was devoted to and over indulgent of John James. Eli Whitney's stepmother was of the traditional sort. It was against her protest that he went to college and entered his useful career. On the whole, stepmothers show up rather well in this study—though perhaps children with the wrong kind of step-parents had little chance of ever reaching the Hall of Fame. Some half dozen of the list are children of a second marriage.

Other Strong Personal Influences.

Of those who had an important influence, other than father or mother, on these famous Americans, there are listed, Teachers 16 who were ministers and 6 who were not; Older Friends 7, Aunts 3, Uncles 4, Adopted Fathers 3, Wives 3, Pastors, other than fathers or teachers, 3, Grandfather 1, Stepfather 1, Stepmother 3, Sisters 2, Sister-in-law 1, and Brother 1. Including the fathers who were ministers, ministers played an important part in the lives of at least 30 of the 63 cases studied. In the above list, exclusive of fathers and mothers, 42 of the 63 persons were deeply influenced by some outside person of record; while in the cases of fuller biographical records several such persons are sometimes mentioned.

Examples of strong influence by an older friend can be found in the friendship of Cuvier, the French palaentologist, and Humboldt, the geographer, for the young Agassiz—whose character had been, however, already largely formed by the influence of his father, a Swiss clergyman, and his wonderful mother. Bancroft, the historian, as we have seen, was fundamentally influenced by his father, a Congregational minister and his mother, but the finishing touches were put on by President Kirkland of Harvard, who directed his studies and

gave him a scholarship for travel abroad. Audubon, having failed of a true mother's influence, was largely made by his wife. He came to America a spoiled lad, extravagant of money and time. After he met and married Lucy Bakewell, Audubon's real career and education commenced. He had the talent. She discovered it. She encouraged him. She taught school and earned money to support him, while he wandered in the wilds and drew pictures of birds for which there was no market and for a long time no prospect nor seeming intention of publishing. Several established ornithologists also greatly helped him—Wilson, Bonaparte, Ord, LeSueur, particularly Harris.

In addition to parents and stepmother, Aunt Esther played a large part in the life of Beecher. Dr. Vinton, rector of St. Paul's deeply influenced Phillips Brooks. In the case of Daniel Boone, in addition to his mother, there was Sarah Day, wife of his brother Sam. In the modeling of the character of the over-sensitive Channing, there is found a master hand in President Stiles of Yale. Then there was Hawthorne's sister, Eliza, and Whittier's Uncle Moses, who was "innocent of books, rich in love of fields and brooks." In his case we have also Aunt Mercy Hussey, who lived in the home, and William Lloyd Garrison.¹⁰ Where sufficient biographical material is available, it is generally apparent that several persons in addition to parents had a deep influence on the life and career studied, but that some one influence is predominant, most often the mother's.

¹ Some exception might be taken to including in this list fathers who lived until the sons reached the early teens, as was the case with Washington and Jefferson, on the ground that the father's influence had already had sufficient time to be effective as a character-forming force. Doubtless this is true in part, but let it be remembered that the time when boys begin to run wild is usually between fourteen and eighteen, a time when the memory of a dead father and the responsibility of a widowed mother might prove strong influences for good.

² Morgan, George, *Patrick Henry*, Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1929, p. 57ff. and Appendix A.

³ Story, W. W., *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*, Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1851, Vol. I, p. 27.

⁴ Agassiz, Elizabeth Cary, *Louis Agassiz, his Life and Correspondence*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1885, p. 19ff.

⁵ Howe, M. A. De Wolfe, *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft*, New York, Charles Scribners Sons, 1908, Vol. II, p. 303.

⁶ Grant, *Memoirs*, p. 23, King, General Charles, *The True Ulysses S. Grant*, p. 31.

⁷ Abbott, Lyman, *Henry Ward Beecher*, p. 24, "Perhaps it is my own half conscious experience of the influence of a mother who died in my early childhood which makes me the more ready to believe that this mother's personal influence over her boy of strange contradictions did not end when God took her from his sight."

⁸ Stebbins, Emma, *Charlotte Cushman*, pp. 58-60.

⁹ Farnham, Charles H., *A Life of Francis Parkman*, p. 81; p. 340. The brother is mentioned but twice in the volume.

¹⁰ Underwood, F. H., *John Greenleaf Whittier*, p. 46-48.

CHAPTER V.

CHILDHOOD OF FAMOUS AMERICANS

Childhood of Famous Americans

Happiness:

Very happy	47
Moderately	9
Unhappy	6
No information	1

—

63

Kindly Treated:

Yes	58
Not	3
No information	2

—

63

Discipline:

Strict	37
Moderate	11
Lax	11
No information	4

—

63

Health:

Excellent	16
Good	30
Poor	13
No information	4

—

63

Physique:

Strong	42
Sickly	11
Medium	7
No information	3

—

63

Industry:

Marked	46
Moderate	4
Indolent	10
No information	3

—

63

Precocity:

Marked	27
Moderate	7
Not precocious	15
Not mentioned	14

—

63

Truthfulness:

Naturally truthful	40
Not truthful	5
No information	18

—

63

Childhood Home Conditions and Personal Traits

Criteria

THE childhood of the sixty-three subjects was tested regarding the following home conditions and personal traits: *Happiness, kindness, discipline, chores, corporal punishment, work, health, physique, industry, precocity, truthfulness, defects, illnesses, difficulties, inhibitions, selfishness.* Several of the categories had to be dropped because the information was too scanty or too confused and vague to be of use. In the remaining cases, in which some facts of possible value were collected, the following criteria for classification were set up:

Happiness was considered to be of primary importance, particularly if a causal connection could be established with other features of the home. Three degrees of happiness or unhappiness were established. Very happy was taken as the first. Childhood is the age of happiness. Granted health, food and clothing, love, sunshine, companionship, and the changing seasons,—the birthright of the normal American child,—one may be counted on to find or make his own happiness. Unhappiness in such cases comes only from definite negative causes. It was found that if all seven of the above characteristics were present, with no serious disturbing feature, the child was generally described as very happy. We therefore adopted evidence of that birthright, plus the lack of evidence of conditions to cause unhappiness, as our criterion of very happy. For moderately happy, one or more of the seven determinants was lacking. For unhappy, definite cause of continued nervous tension and maladjustment was present.

The next point, which might throw light on causes of happiness and unhappiness, was *treatment*. Kind treatment included provision of the necessary physical requisites, home, food, and clothing, and in addition normal pleasures of leisure,

play, and amusement, without brutal or unreasonable punishment. The percent of kind treatment ran so high that the degrees of unkindness were not divided into classes. Unkindness was of two kinds,—physical or mental,—direct evidence of severe and unreasonable physical punishment, or the provocation of mental anguish upon a sensitive spirit to such a degree as to overbalance the effects of affection.

Discipline is divided into Strict, Moderate, and Lax. The criterion for strict discipline is exact obedience to parents, or guardian, enforced "because I say so," or "by the will of God," by direct and strong moral suasion, plus generally physical punishment where necessary. It may or may not be tempered by love; it is at least exact. Moderate discipline is that which allows for an increasing amount of reasonableness and interplay of wills between parent and child. A measure of self determination is definitely sought in the child's behavior. Lax discipline, which may show spots of severity, is that condition in which the child, while still a minor and living under the parental roof, is definitely and repeatedly out of control.

No particular criteria were set up for classing *chores*, *work*, and *corporal punishment*. The information, which is not as full as expected, will simply be tabulated and described.

Criteria for the personal traits are *health*, excellent, where the subject exhibits exceptional physical vitality, without serious illnesses or defects. Those were classed as having good health who performed all the normal functions of life without marked handicap. Probably fuller information would raise some of the "good" to excellent. Poor health is checked only where long continued physical defect or marked weakness is definitely indicated. Physique follows closely health, except that it deals with the apparent physical equipment, and gives a cross check on causes for health difficulties. Some biographers give their information in terms of health and some of physique. The relation is close, and a comparison of the two sets of findings clarifies the picture.

Like health and physique, industry and precocity go to-

gether. *Precocity* is the datum; *industry* is the index of the efficient use of the given equipment. During the time under review neither achievement nor intelligence tests were in existence, hence modern terms such as I. Q., can not be applied. A boy or girl is described as industrious who regularly fulfilled the tasks assigned at home and at school. The moderately industrious performed their tasks either without enthusiasm or under pressure. The indolent definitely resisted routine or assigned tasks.

Precocity is more difficult to measure without scientific tests. It is, however, a favorite subject on which biographers like to comment. Little stress is laid on the value of these statements regarding precocity; they have been simply recorded with reservations or revisions in the light of, (1) the sort of evidence the biographer produces, and (2) experience in intelligence testing.

Evidence regarding *truthfulness* may not itself be overtruthful. Much depends on the point of view and fulness of information of the author of the original source material. Criteria for naturally truthful are (1) a character of marked probity in later life, (2) a full description of childhood and early training, (3) no evidence of a disciplinary problem of truth telling, (4) evident confidence on the part of parents. These criteria are not very satisfactory, but are the best that could be devised with the type of material available. Whether this was "natural truthfulness," truth by precept, or truth telling learned by imitation from truth telling adults, is the question. Untruthfulness is assigned only where there is direct evidence of a habit of deception, of which one or two instances only may be given.

The remaining five points among personal traits, i.e., *defects*, *illnesses*, *difficulties*, *inhibitions*, *selfishness*,—are not of such a nature as to lend themselves to comparative classification, with definite criteria. They were a dragnet, to see what, if any, suggestive information might be drawn up. They are chiefly valuable in giving a negative check on health and

home conditions elsewhere tabulated. Special information on these points was noted, and will be described and discussed in the last section of this chapter.

Happiness.

The childhood of 47 of these Americans has been rated as very happy, 9 moderately happy, 6 unhappy and only one no information. One thinks immediately of Sam Clemens as immortalized in Tom Sawyer, painting the fence or going fishing with Huck Finn; of Cooper from the manor house on Lake Otsego, or Boone from the frontier cabin, roving the unspoiled woods filled with game; of Alice Freeman gathering the eggs in her apron, taking her little brother and sisters to school as she helped her mother, or driving about with her father in his buggy when he made his calls on the sick; or of the Agassiz home in Switzerland, with its vineyard and its fish pool, its expeditions by lake and mountain, Summer and Winter, its sports, festivals and peasant dances, its loving family circle gathered about the fireside for family worship, followed by reading aloud, or drawing and mounting scientific specimens—surely such scenes, if any, reflect happiness. In such homes the worries of parents pass lightly over the children, and though there were disobediences and punishments, sicknesses and disappointment, they loomed but little in the atmosphere of sunshine and childish enthusiasm. One of the best pictures we have of simple child happiness is that which Lucretia Chandler Bancroft, herself born to wealth and luxury but married to a poor preacher, draws of gathering her ten children about her to feed them, "rye bread toasted, the fragments of cold coffee boyled and put on milk," but they ate it and were thankful, because she gave it them.² Among those ten children was George Bancroft, the future historian and Minister to Great Britain.

Among the moderately happy is Eads, selling apples and newspapers in St. Louis, to help his mother, who took boarders because the father did not support the family, or Benjamin

Franklin, restricted by a dictatorial father and early put at tasks which he disliked. In the unhappy group has been placed Channing, who definitely said, "mine was not a happy childhood." He was a sensitive child and longed for love, but got discipline; he craved companionship, but was ragged and teased by his brothers.³ Hawthorne's is a borderline case; but after due consideration he too was placed among the unhappy. He had some things to bring happiness,—a good home and all the physical comforts, books, and the lake and the woods, which he loved; but on the whole, his life was sad and lonely. His father was dead, his mother a recluse; laughter was hushed and young companionship denied. An air of gloom hung continually about the home, and there were few opportunities of relieving it, except in the lonely silence of the woods.⁴ Lincoln probably belongs in this group, owing partly to the death of his mother and the conditions of poverty in which he lived, but in large measure to his temperament. He was too sensitive and intelligent to be happy in such hard surroundings.

Treatment in Childhood.

Of the 63 under study, 58 are said to have been treated with kindness, or a distinctly kindly picture of their childhood home is drawn; 3 possibly 4 not kindly treated, one or two insufficient information. These 58 who were kindly treated include the 47 who were very happy, and in fact most of the rest on the list. Their parents or foster parents gave them a good, if not luxurious, home; and they had, often partly by their own exertions, sufficient food and clothing; nor were they violently beaten or viciously punished by the members of the family who had authority over them. It is a negative check on the loving devotion with which most of them were surrounded, and further description or illustration is not necessary.

But all of those who were only moderately happy were kindly treated, and a study of those nine cases may be of value, in connection with the two who were unhappy, yet kindly treated. The nine include Peter Cooper, where there was

poverty, struggle, and unsuccess, Fulton, Eads, Howe, and Jackson. Gilbert Stuart, who speaks with bitterness of the hovel they lived in on the Long Wharf at Newport, belongs in the same class,—the trouble basically economic due to the inefficiency of the father.

In one or two cases one suspects liquor as the cause of paternal failure, but the biographers do not state such things openly. One finds equal poverty in other cases which rate very happy,—some of them cases of a widow who had a hard struggle, but with this poverty a spiritual resiliency which overcame all obstacles and insisted on being happy. This leaves Irving, Poe and Whitney to complete the nine. Irving's is a borderline case—one might say that he was happy in many ways, or again one might say that he was not kindly treated by his father. There was certainly a maladjustment there, due to his father's religious bigotry and despotism, which brought much unhappiness, yet there seems to have been no extreme cruelty and much kindness. Poe is also difficult to place. He met with kindness and over indulgence from his mother while she lived, and from his foster parents during his boyhood, but here is a case of nervous instability, somewhat like that of Hawthorne, that does not know how to enjoy happiness, aggravated by pride and arrogance on the part of the boy, and lack of sympathetic understanding in his foster father. In Whitney's case it did not go so deep, a nervous, handsome, brilliant boy, opposed by an unsympathetic step-mother. He threw off the pall soon after leaving home, and seems to have gained much happiness in later and successful years.

There were two, Hawthorne and Horace Mann, who rated as kindly treated and yet unhappy. In the case of Hawthorne one is apt at first sight to blame Puritanism, for his genius wandered so largely through the darker shadows of a Puritan past. Yet the Hawthornes of his time were no longer theologically Puritan, rather Unitarians of a mild and not too assiduous type. The difficulty seems to have been nerves—if

caused by earlier Puritanism, who can say?—in both the parents, which made of his father a martinet and his mother a recluse. Kindness and physical comfort could not overcome the mental gloom of that home. Horace Mann's childhood was shadowed by a severe case of Puritanism, yet without physical or intentional mental unkindness. He, like Whitney, was able to throw off the early complex. He later attained a, to him, satisfactory religious standpoint and an unusual degree of emotional stability and happiness.

There were four who met with considerable unkindness in childhood and with it, perhaps as a consequence of it, sadness—Channing, Grant, Lincoln, and St. Gaudens. The degree of unkindness was not in any of the four instances such as would have deeply affected the average child. But they were in each case exceptionally brilliant and sensitive children, on whom suffering left a deeper scar. The effect of their childhood's suffering seems traceable in the career of each of the four,—careers so divergent as the ministry, military service, statesmanship and sculpture—and this suffering may be in part responsible for the heights to which those careers attained.

Discipline.

In matters of home discipline, 37 are classed strict, 11 moderate, 11 lax and 4 not sufficient information. Of the 37, there were 22 New England orthodox Puritans, and 1 each Unitarian, Episcopalian, and Quaker of Puritan lineage; 7 were Presbyterian of non-New England origin; 1 each Baptist and Methodist and Quaker, and 2 Southern Episcopalian. A large proportion of these were families where the discipline was enforced chiefly by love rather than frequent or severe corporal punishment, yet the discipline was there. Obedience was in almost all these cases exacted as a religious duty. In some cases the father was severe, the mother lax or gentle, in some the father refused to help and an unruly son became too much for the mother (Clemens, "Mark Twain"), in a number there was more or less definite rebellion, (Beecher, Clemens,

Franklin, Irving, Mitchell, Frances Willard) at some time during the teen age, generally without serious consequences or permanent resentment. Not over two or three show any serious complexes as a result of over severity, and in those cases the severity seemed to come from a previous complex or defect in one of the parents.⁵

The eleven cases of moderate discipline classify as 6 Unitarians or Liberal Congregationalists of Puritan origin, 2 of combined Puritan and Roman Catholic influence, and 3 Episcopalian. Of these 11 brought up on moderate discipline, 7 took little part in church life thereafter, Emerson and Madison being the most actively interested. This group may be described as highly moral, generally spiritual, but religiously individualistic.

Of the 11 who come under the classification of lax discipline, 3 rank as mainly or nominally Roman Catholic, though none of the 3 followed that faith in later years, (Audubon, Eads and St. Gaudens) 2 were mainly under Episcopalian influences, (Jefferson and Poe), 2 were in homes chiefly Presbyterian, (Peter Cooper and Hamilton) neither of whom kept much church connection; 1 each was Baptist, Unitarian, Congregational and Quaker. (Lincoln, Hawthorne, Story and Boone). Of these 11 only 2 are recorded as church members, though 5 additional would certainly rate as distinctly religious.

Health.

The matter of *health* is often passed by by biographers unless there was some definite physical difficulty. There were 16 who rate excellent, 30 good, (the distinction not always clear) 13 poor, and 4 not sufficient information. This list relates fairly closely with the list on *Physique*, 42 strong, 7 medium, 11 sickly, 3 no information. They were for the most part of hardy stock; and led open-air, rigorous lives. Few had serious health situations to meet (though in some of the large pioneer families there was a heavy infant mortality). A number of the fathers or grandfathers are said to have been of remarkable

physique (Beecher, Franklin, Jefferson); others themselves performed exceptional feats of strength, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Boone⁶. Of the 13 who had poor health, or were sickly in childhood, Motley was delicate and sensitive, Parkman had much ill-health, including trouble with heart and eyes,—the instance that led to his famous trip over the Oregon trail, and he later overcame almost insuperable obstacles in the writing of his histories.⁷ Madison gave up his studies for the ministry at Princeton on account of his health, and always thereafter was handicapped. Poe while physically fine looking, must have suffered from some nervous disorder. Bryant suffered from weak lungs, an enlarged head, continual illnesses. There seems to be no particular correlation for these facts.

Industry and Precocity.

According to biographers, 46 showed marked industry in their childhood, 4 were moderately industrious, 10 were indolent and 3 no information. This industry was either in chores and work about the home, or early employment, or study. No noticeable correlation has been discovered between health or physique and either precocity or industry. Some of the strongest physically were indolent and some were very precocious and *vice versa*. Of course no standards of mental measurement existed for these subjects, but for all a high intelligence in some fields, at least, must be assumed. Granted a usable body, the essential to a life of distinction seems to be a configuration of qualities which include enthusiasm as an emotional quality which eventually becomes an enthusiasm for something,—it is a purpose, but it must be a lasting emotion, *capable of being longer sustained* than is common among people.

Those marked indolent in boyhood, as Brooks or Patrick Henry, had to pass through some spiritual or mental awakening before their life became effective. Those rated not precocious had a counter balance of sustained purpose to make up for a lack of mental quickness. But it seems that some really great minds mature slowly, or are temporarily retarded; for

example Channing is distinctly shown to have been not precocious as a young child, yet Joseph Story, his class-mate at Harvard speaks of his extreme brilliance during college years.⁸ Despite early retardation Channing entered Harvard at fourteen, and divided the highest honors with Story. Clay and Fenimore Cooper were neither precocious; both were said to be slow to develop and late in realizing their powers.

Only 27 of the 63 are pictured by their biographers as precocious,—a remarkable tribute to the honesty of these writers, who, dealing with persons who afterwards proved great leaders in their respective fields, might according to popular expectation have declared them all to have been infant geniuses. Seven are rated as average, and 15 are distinctly pictured as not precocious. In the cases of 14 the evidence is not conclusive either way.

Precocity

Comparing Nineteen famous Americans found in Genetic Studies

Nineteen of the 63 characters in this study are included in the 301 "geniuses" rated for their I.Q. by Miss Cox in *Genetic Studies of Genius*.⁹ An interesting comparison of the results there obtained may be made with the results of this study. That study is made for a different purpose and on a different system of arrangement of data, so that a slight rearrangement of the data in *Genetic Studies* is necessary in order to secure a comparison. Miss Cox gives in each case the evidence where obtained of precocity, or definitely states that there is "no specific reference" to precocity. The category of "no specific reference" corresponds exactly to the classification, "no evidence" in the present study. The present author, in order to secure a comparison, has rated Miss Cox's evidence to classify the characters as *Precocious*, *Little Specific Evidence*, *Not Precocious*, and *No Specific Reference*.

The results are shown on the accompanying table.

The results are sufficiently close to be valuable, and sufficiently different to be interesting. The differences may be tallied

Data Sheet for Precocity
Comparing Nineteen Famous Americans found in Genetic Studies of
Genius.

Name	Page	Coef.	I.Q.	Precocity in Genetic Stud.	Rating in Famous Americans
Adams, J.	273	.20	120	No Spec. Ref.	No Evidence
Adams, J. Q.	649	.65	165	Precocious	Precocious
Agassiz,	449	.75	140	L. S. E.	Precocious
Channing	508	.60	145	Not Precoc.	Not precocious
Emerson	517	.75	145	L. S. E.	Moderately Prec.
Farragut	282	.43	120	L. S. E.	Precocious
Franklin	524	.60	145	L. S. E.	Precocious
Fulton	711	.11	105	Precocious	Moderately Prec.
Hamilton	409	.53	135	Precocious	Precocious
Irving	359	.43	130	L. S. E.	Moderately Prec.
Jackson	247	.43	110	No Spec. Ref.	No evidence
Jefferson	536	.60	145	L. S. E.	No evidence
Lee	720	.43	130	L. S. E.	No evidence
Lincoln	325	.43	125	No Spec. Ref.	No evidence
Longfellow	587	.75	150	Precocious	Precocious
Madison	293	.20	120	No Spec. Ref.	No evidence
Sherman	339	.20	125	No Spec. Ref.	Not precocious
Washington	345	.60	125	No Spec. Ref.	Not precocious
Webster	551	.60	145	Precocious	Precocious

Precocious	5	7
Little Specific Evidence	7	
Moderately Precocious		3
Not Precocious	1	3
No Specific Reference or No evidence	6	6

on three counts, 1. different data obtained, 2. different evaluation of the reliability of the data, and 3. different measure of what constitutes evidence of precocity. In the cases of the five

where Miss Cox gives specific evidence of precocity, the present writer agrees in four cases. In the case of Fulton, the fifth, Miss Cox gives evidence of early inventions by Fulton, which the present writer considers apochryphal. Miss Cox gives little evidence of precocity in the cases of Agassiz and Farragut; or lays little stress on the evidence given. In the case of Agassiz, he was very advanced in school, made brilliant records in Latin, Greek, French, German, English, and Italian, as well as the sciences; was athletic, successful in games and sports, and clever in handicrafts learned from the peasants. The present writer finds this sufficient evidence of precocity. Miss Cox mentions the appointment of Farragut as a midshipman at the tender age of nine, but does not draw attention to it as evidence of precocity. The present writer finds that appointment and its successful outcome sufficient evidence to class Farragut as precocious. The appointment in itself would not be conclusive.

The author of the *Genetic Studies* seems not to have been looking for negative evidence against precocity. In the case of Channing, however, such negative evidence is clearly given—"He was called patient and diligent but was not remarkable for quickness of perception . . . He was even thought dull."¹⁰ In two other cases Miss Cox simply states under precocity, "No Specific Record." Sufficient evidence is given in these two cases, Sherman and Washington, in the available biographical material, to show with fair certainty that they were not precocious, and the present writer has so classed them.

In four additional cases Miss Cox gives "No Specific Record,"—John Adams, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and James Madison, in all of which cases the present writer agrees. Thus the agreements, while not startling, are considerable, and the differences are easily understandable.

Miss Cox rates each of the subjects on Intelligence, the lowest in this list being Fulton, 105, and the highest John Quincy Adams, 165, the average being 133. In each case the relative coefficient of the data is given, that of Fulton being only .11, which is also the lowest coefficient, showing the

biographical material to be particularly meager or unreliable. She concludes that the rating varies with the completeness of the data, and that many of these characters would be, if all evidence were available, as high as I.Q. 200 or more.¹¹ This seems to be a reasonable conclusion, on general principles; but the present writer doubts the scientific value of attempting to assign I.Q. percentages to historical personages, in the present state of biographical material. There is a better chance of rating them socially for character study purposes on their behavior record.

Truthfulness.

An attempt was made to classify the members of the group with respect to early or natural truthfulness. In 40 cases the evidence seems sufficient to class the child as "naturally truthful"—whatever that may mean—in 5 cases there was clear evidence of difficulty in the matter of truth telling,—18 not classified.

Of the New England group 26 were "naturally truthful,"—all with a home training of religion and discipline; 8 rate insufficient information, as follows: Howe, Longfellow, Lowell, Morton, Morse, Gilbert Stuart, Webster, Whittier. There are no marked difficulties with truthfulness in this group. There are 14 others who are said to have been naturally truthful, Agassiz, Fenimore Cooper, Farragut, Hamilton, J. Henry, Jackson, Jefferson, Kent, Lee, Lincoln, Marshall, Palmer, Sherman and Washington. Of these, eleven had religious discipline in the home,—the majority strict discipline, with a Puritan flavor. The three where the discipline and religion may be in any way questioned are Farragut, Jefferson and Lincoln, each an interesting individual case in itself.

The five in whose cases some difficulty in truth telling is noted are Clemens, Fulton, Irving, Poe and St. Gaudens. The former three of these were from Puritan or Calvinistic homes, and all were of the artistic temperament. Two of these cases can be directly traced to over strict and uneven discipline.

Mark Twain is an example—punished by being made to go to church Sunday nights, in proof of which he had to tell his mother the minister's text,—he lied to his mother and made up the texts. There is no great mystery about that. In much the same way Washington Irving deceived his father about going to the theatre. Poe had both a neurasthenic heritage, and lack of early training. St. Gaudens lacked the home training and ran with a New York City slum gang. Truthfulness would seem therefore to depend mainly on parents with a regard for truth, plus well-considered, even-handed discipline. "Temperament" seems also to be a factor to be considered, as all the above five belong to the artistic group. Fulton seems to have found difficulty in distinguishing between fact and fiction, a statement that might likewise well apply to Mark Twain and others of the artistic-creative temperament.

Physical defects.

The following bodily defects are noted:

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Beecher | an impediment in his speech which he overcame. |
| Bryant | a large head and a puny body. He was always delicate. |
| Grant | chills and fever, extreme nervousness, amounting to an inhibition in his hate of the tannery, while his love of animals was almost an obsession. |
| Hawthorne | lame in his boyhood, and extremely bashful. |
| J. Henry | constitutionally weak. |
| Holmes | delicate, afflicted with asthma. |
| Howe | lame. |
| Irving | tendency to tuberculosis. |
| Madison | constitutionally weak. |
| Morse | delicate. |
| Parkman | heart trouble, weak, later almost blind. |

The struggles of some of these men to overcome their bodily defects make inspiring reading. The list may be interesting in

itself, but it is not long enough nor serious enough to be impressive.

Illnesses.

Only two or three cases of special illnesses are noted, and they have no marked significance.

Difficulties.

The chief difficulty encountered was *poverty*. Thirty-one cases are noted of what would be considered today extreme poverty,—cases which either prevented any formal higher education, or made the securing of an education extremely difficult. This poverty and the accompanying difficulties were certainly more extreme than that commonly encountered today in the self-supporting college student.

The second difficulty in importance is *nervousness*. Fourteen are pronounced extremely nervous or over sensitive. Among them may be found Beecher, Channing, Grant, Hawthorne, Jefferson, who early lost his voice when he tried to make a speech and was never an easy speaker; Kent, Lee and Madison much the same; Motley, very shy; Clay and Webster could neither of them learn to recite by heart, and were very nervous about their speaking. Thus it would appear that the majority of those who were noted as public speakers had early difficulty with their speaking. Out of the list of those who had defects and those who were extremely nervous are made up the thirteen who are elsewhere tabulated as having poor health. Five show signs of nervous disturbances through *religious fears*, among them Channing, Horace Mann, and Mark Twain. In Channing's case these fears may even have affected his health as a child.

Selfishness.

Sufficient information was not found to be worth tabulating on native selfishness. Three were sufficiently spoiled by indulgent parents or guardians to have serious adjustment problems

later. What percent of this was temperamental and what lack of discipline can not now be determined.

Summary.

A composite picture of the childhood of these Famous Americans shows a happy, simple, and unpretentious home, with parents devoted to each other and to a large family of children. There was moderate discipline, or if strict, much tempered by love and kindness. Most of them were healthy young animals, but high-strung and nervous, and where there were health difficulties, these were turned to account in character education. They were industrious, with chores and school lessons, many of them having their own way to make towards an education. Those who spent idle years in their teens were active mentally, even if not fond of farm and physical labor. Some, who did not love their lessons, were learning life by careful observation. A few were mentally precocious; others concealed what brilliance they possessed under an air of deliberation. They learned truth in word and deed from their parents. Those who did not learned to lie through fear; or they had that artistic temperament which draws no hard lines between fact and fancy. Their characters were laid in religion, and they grew up resembling parents who worshipped, if sometimes they also feared, the Lord.

¹ Agassiz, Elizabeth Cary, *Louis Agassiz, His Life and Correspondence*, p. 2, p. 8ff.

² Howe, M. A. DeWolfe, *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft*, vol. I, p. 16.

³ Chadwick, John W., *William Ellery Channing*, p. 14, "He was not a happy boy, because his parents, doing their duty by him in the most conscientious manner, were not affable and friendly with him."

⁴ Hawthorne, Julian, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife*, p. 96. "For months together, I scarcely held human intercourse outside of my own family." p. 196, "But often I was happy,—at least as happy as I knew how to be, or was aware of the possibility of being." Despite this claim on his part,

Hawthorne must be judged on any comparative scale to have been in the main unhappy. He was not aware of real happiness.

⁵ Later in this chapter, under the heading of "Truthfulness," the unwise type of discipline in the case of Mark Twain is referred to.

⁶ As showing the rustic manners of the country, the measure of strength was lifting a barrel and drinking out of the bung-hole, in the North, cider, at the South, whisky. This feat is ascribed to Lincoln, to Peter Jefferson, and others.

⁷ Parkman's achievement against heavy handicaps of suffering and ill-health are remarkable and rank with the most difficult. Farnham, Charles Haight, *Francis Parkman*, p. 28ff. He suffered from arthritis and was long confined to a wheel chair; blindness threatened, and he was kept in a dark room for several years; he was sent to France in search of health, and the Paris physicians ordered him to cease from all work on account of impending insanity; yet in the midst of all these, he was writing histories which have become classics, and was so successful with horticulture as to be offered a professorship at Harvard.

⁸ Channing, *Memoirs*, vol. I., p. 26. "As a pupil it is said that William was patient and diligent, but not remarkable for quickness of perception. . . . Indeed, like many men, afterwards distinguished for intellectual power, he was thought dull." A careful reading of this extensive and detailed passage leads one to surmise that he was supranormal in intelligence and very deliberate in judgment.

⁹ Cox, Catherine Morris, *Genetic Study of Genius*, Stanford University, Stanford University Press, 1926, 3 vols., vol. 2., *Early Mental Traits of Three Hundred Geniuses*.

¹⁰ Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 509.

¹¹ Cox, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

CHAPTER VI.

SCHOOLING OF FAMOUS AMERICANS

Schooling of Famous Americans

Tables

Age began School

At 2—2

3—2

4—8

5—6

6—1

7—1

Total reported—20

Median—4 years

Average—4.5 years

Years before College

Years 2— 1

7— 1

8— 2

9— 1

10— 6

11— 4

12— 6

13— 2

14— 1

Total reported—24

Median 11 years

Average 10 years

Progress in School

Advanced 29

Average 14

Retarded 5

No information 15

Total 63

Very little schooling 18

No formal higher educa-
tion later 13Formal higher education
later 5

18Informal higher education
later 10

No higher education later 3

13

Reported Intelligence

Exceptional 42

Average 6

Poor 0

No information 15

Total 63

Reported Influence of Teachers

Markedly advantageous 30

Slight 12

Detrimental 5

Not noted 16

Total 63

Mental Habits

Methodical	34
Haphazard	18
Not noted	11
	—
	63

Reported Scholastic Standing

<i>Excelled</i>		<i>Poor</i>	
In all subjects	14	In Classics	4
Classics	3	Mathematics	7
Mathematics	10	Literature	2
Literature	14	Catechism	1
Music	3	Philosophy	1
Spelling	2		
Writing	4		
Science	3		
None	5		
No information	16		

Moral Education and Discipline in School

<i>Games and Play</i>			
Fond of and successful in	33	Strict	38
Not fond of	5	Lax	5
No opportunity	5	No information	20
Fond of but not successful	1		—
No information	19		63
	—		
	63		

Schooling of Famous Americans

Criteria

NO criteria for classification are needed in age of entering school, or years before college. In the field of *progress and retardation* in school and *intelligence*, in the pre-Binet period, one must rely on the unscientific guesses of teachers and friends, plus such factual statements as can be gleaned. The classifications, *advanced*, *average*, and *retarded* are on the basis of statements of biographers, usually quoted from interested observers, where the biographer gave some supporting evidence for his statement. They denote advanced or retarded as compared with the average of the group, or neighborhood. The judgments for intelligence are by the same rule of thumb method, and on the same basis for criteria. The value, if any, of tabulating these points lies first in a possible judgment of the fair-mindedness of biographers, and second in a comparison, even if somewhat crude, of achievement in school with ability. In the light of such available evidence, was there a close correspondence between intelligence and advancement in school? What type of person of high intelligence was retarded in school, and what are the reasons?

In *influence of teachers* the classifications are *markedly advantageous*, *slight*, and *negative*. Markedly advantageous denotes evidence for the awakening under the influence of the teacher concerned of strong motivation toward integration of character and for a useful career. In certain cases information is definite that no such influence came from teachers, which cases are marked slight. Negative influence denotes over-strict discipline or unjust punishment which gives evidence of being an actual handicap in personal adjustment or integration of character.

Classifications for *mental habits* are *haphazard* and *methodical*. This is one of the few places where the old classifications of temperament, to which moral philosophers gave so much space, are applicable. *Haphazard* is used to denote those who were "naturally careless," who up to the time described had not been successfully subjected to either interior or exterior discipline. *Methodical* denotes those who in school worked constructively, as if with some method or purpose in view.

No accurate criteria were developed for classification of *attitude toward games and play*. It seemed sufficient to tabulate the available facts, as a part of the picture. Criteria for *discipline in school* are the same as for discipline in the home, with the substitution of the teacher for the parent or parents.

Age at Which They Began School.

Although only twenty report the age of the pupils when they began attending school, from conditions depicted this appears to give a fair picture of the situation. Two began formal schooling at the age of two years, the largest number at four, and one did not begin until the age of seven. This gives a median age of four years, and an average of $4\frac{1}{2}$, which is not far from the ages for beginning at present. There was, however, no kindergarten in those days, and these children began immediately on reading, writing, spelling, and 'rithmetic. There was no strict system of grades, forms, and promotions. Most of the schools attended (outside of the Boston Latin School) were of the one room, one teacher type. The pupils were allowed to go on as rapidly as they were able. Subjects were few; books were few; drill was thorough. The vast majority of teachers were men—ministers or theological students. School discipline was strict, and enforced with the ferrule and the switch.

Years Before College.

Twenty-four report an average of ten years' schooling before entering college. The school years were in most cases short, in many instances three to five months. The subject matter

except for the classics was much more limited than today. The pupils received a large amount of personal attention from the teachers,—in fact the whole system amounted practically to *individual tutoring*,—which probably accounts for the rapid progress made. The indications are that in the subjects studied, notably Latin, Greek, and Mathematics, the attainments were for the few who continued in school quite as high as, and possibly higher than today. For the most part only those of high intelligence continued long in school.

The education of John Quincy Adams for example was largely informal,—much of it while traveling with his father. At the age of fourteen he was secretary to the American legation at St. Petersburg.¹ He returned to America, entered Harvard at eighteen, and graduated two years later with a brilliant record. George Bancroft, after two years at Exeter, entered Harvard at thirteen where there were then three hundred students. He wrote a thesis on astronomy in Latin and attained Phi Beta Kappa.² Henry Ward Beecher hated school. He was rather retarded. He ran wild at the Boston Latin School, and "something had to be done." He was put into the Mt. Pleasant Military Institute, where he had an intellectual and spiritual awakening.³ He had thirteen years' schooling before entering Amherst. Daniel Boone had no regular schooling. He learned the rudiments of reading and writing from his sister-in-law. He learned hunting, fishing, and all the art of frontier life from his environment. James Madison was typical of the Southern planter. He had thirteen years before entering Princeton, much of it with the Reverend Thomas Martin, a Scotsman who was imported for the purpose and lived in the house as tutor.

Progress in School and Intelligence.

As there were no psychological tests, the information on progress and retardation in school may well be inaccurate. The report is 29 advanced, 14 average, 5 retarded, and 15 no information. Over against this 42 are reported as of exceptional in-

telligence, 6 as average, none as of poor intelligence, and again 15 no information. That is, 20% of the total number, or 30% of the number reported, had exceptional intelligence, but did not do particularly well in school. Of these typical examples are Beecher, Patrick Henry, Fenimore Cooper, and Mark Twain. They were not intellectually awakened. They did not care, were not interested. They were unruly at school. In some but not all cases there was evident uneven and ill advised discipline at home. The majority of these did not go to college, or if they entered college, did not complete the course. Their awakening occurred in connection with some outside interest or undertaking, after which they became self-educated, as Mark Twain with his writing or Patrick Henry with law and politics.⁵

The Self Educated Group.

Eighteen had little schooling, of whom thirteen had no formal higher education later, and five managed by their own efforts to later secure the formal education. Ten later secured an informal higher education in their particular fields. These figures are due almost entirely to frontier and pioneer conditions. There were no art, engineering, or technical schools. Those who achieved in these fields had to find their education as and how they could. Artists like Gilbert Stuart, Robert Fulton, and S. F. B. Morse picked up what they could in this country, and later managed to reach England where they worked under some artist of established reputation like Benjamin West.⁶ Both Fulton and Morse had had pronounced success in art. They abandoned their art for experimental invention in the field of engineering, for which neither had had any previous training.

Pioneers in Education.

In many cases the people here listed were the pioneers in establishing education in some particular field—Morse founded and was the first president of the American Academy at New York; Horace Mann gave up his law practise to establish the free public school system of Massachusetts; Emma Willard

had a family to support and was an enthusiast for higher education for women; she established the first permanent, endowed school for girls; as later Mary Lyon and Alice Freeman Palmer pioneered in Women's education. The old system of studying law and medicine was substantially apprenticeship. Kent and Story established the teaching of law at Columbia and Harvard; Dr. Holmes pioneered in medicine at Harvard. Thus frontier and haphazard conditions were turned into systematic training in these various fields. All those in this list, who worked in the field of education, were of strong religious motivation.

Influence of Teachers.

In the descriptions of school life some teacher is mentioned in 30 cases as having a markedly advantageous influence; in 12 cases the influence of teachers is described as slight; in 5 cases negative, and 16 not reported. In 16 of the 30 cases a minister is mentioned by name as having had an advantageous influence. In a number of others the father was a minister and did a part of the teaching, while in others the school attended was a church school and the teacher generally a minister. In one of the five negative cases, the difficulty was with a minister who was also a teacher, who flogged Joseph Story unjustly. In only four or five cases are women teachers mentioned, one of them adversely. In the negative cases,—Channing, a sensitive child, was flogged by a teacher who kept discipline with a long pole; ~~Mark Twain~~ was generally obstreperous and unhappy in school; Grant was flogged at school as well as at home, which helped to break his spirit; Irving's teachers were "incompetent"; St. Gaudens' teachers in down town New York had poor or little influence. The Boston Latin School, Andover and Scotch ministers like the Campbells in Virginia, were major focal points of good schooling.

Mental Habits.

Of the total number, 34 are reported as methodical, 18 haphazard, and 11 not noted. Of the 18 classed as haphazard, or "naturally careless," 4 are said to have become systematic

through the influence of teachers or school discipline. A popular descriptive phrase with some biographers is "quick and accurate," while others describe their subject as "slow and thorough," which seems to be a valid distinction in temperament. In the haphazard group are most of the authors, artists, orators, and politicians; (Audubon, the Beechers, Clay, Clemens, Cooper, Cushman, etc.); in the methodical group are lawyers, scientists, historical and military men. It is hard to tell whether keeping a diary is a symptom or a disease,—but those who kept diaries were or became systematic. The majority of those reported methodical had early, severe or moderate discipline, but several cases of good moderate discipline failed to produce methodical habits.

Scholastic Standing.

Biographers describe fourteen as having excelled in all subjects, three in classics, ten in mathematics, fourteen in literature, three in music, two in spelling, four in writing, three in science, five in no subject, and sixteen no information.

Against these four were poor in classics, seven in mathematics, two in literature, and one each in catechism, and philosophy. It is probable that differences in teaching and attendant circumstances may have affected these figures. It is difficult to generalize from them.

Games and Play.

There are 33 who are described as fond of games and play and successful in them, 5 not fond of sports, 5 seem to have had little or no opportunity for sports, 1 fond of sports but not successful, and 19 no information. Organized sport is a comparatively recent development. The sports and play most often mentioned are skating, hunting, fishing, swimming, walking, running, and playing Indian. Pranks and practical jokes are told with a relish, but were usually quite harmless. Probably many of the boys played at tops and "one old cat," but such games are practically unmentioned. John Quincy Adams had

no youth, he was not interested in games and sport; Brooks and Channing also took little part. Fenimore Cooper was a leader in hunting, canoeing, and playing Indian. Jonathan Edwards was writing a treatise on the Soul and studying the life of the spider when most boys were warwhooping like red Indians. Emerson was fond of athletic sports, but not strong enough to take part. Farragut's father made a great companion of his boys in sailing, hunting, and fishing, up to the time that David was adopted by Captain Porter. Mark Twain has immortalized his boyhood in "Tom Sawyer" and "Huck Finn" for boys of all nations and many generations. Few complaints are voiced against the restriction of Puritanism in the field of sports and amusements by either the subjects themselves or their biographers. It is in quite another field,—the depression produced by the doctrines of eternal punishment and predestination—that serious criticism is expressed. Perhaps Mark Twain bore some slight resentment for the uneven hand of "justice" as depicted in Aunt Polly, and Frances Willard gives an amusing picture of "revolt" when she openly read a novel the day she was eighteen, and refused to lay it aside at the parental command.

Moral Education and Discipline in School.

There are references in thirty-eight instances to strict discipline in school, accompanied by some attempt at moral education. In five cases discipline is depicted as lax, and in twenty no information is given. Information on this point is provokingly vague and sketchy. It is often difficult to distinguish between the moral training of the home and the school, as in a number of cases the father was also minister and teacher; others were tutored at home by a member of the family, or by an employed tutor.³

One gains the impression that it was a general practise throughout the country, up until the development of the public school in the West about the time of the Civil War, to open school daily with prayer and Bible reading. In many Eastern

states this custom has continued up to the present time. In many Western states it was never introduced. Practically all the subjects of this study attended schools, either public or private, where this practise was maintained. The Westminster catechism seems to have been taught in some cases. There were the copy book aphorisms and useful lessons in some of the old school reading books, and edifying use of biography. Otherwise we have few references to the definite teaching of ethics.

There is a clear picture of the training of General Sherman, which seems to be typical. Samuel L. Howe, the son of Sherman's old teacher, wrote in the *Iowa State Register*, "My father was especially devoted to the inculcation of moral principle, heart culture, in the minds of his pupils. He constantly instilled these great principles into the minds of the young under his care with all the power at his command. And when love failed to accomplish the work, then physical discipline was called in."⁹ The writer thus relates how, when the Sherman boys were the leaders in all the deviltry, the widow Sherman was called in and watched with approval the whipping of her sons. "The boys gave him a long and severe struggle and his clothing was badly torn and disarranged in the contest. From this time forward the boys were the models of the school and on the front rank both in moral and mental leadership." Sherman himself later gave testimony to the salutary effect of this chastisement and the power over him of the teacher who administered it.

There are a number of instances of religious evangelism in the boarding schools,—particularly among the women,—where the system is described with exhaustive detail,—Mary Lyon, Frances Willard and Harriet Beecher Stowe.¹⁰ In these three cases it was emotional and strained. Great pressure was brought to bear on the "unsaved." There seem to have been definite positive moral and social results in the cases where the emotional release of conversion was achieved. In many cases it was not achieved.

One of the few traces of the teaching of systematic ethics, apart from religion and the catechism, is found in the Rules of

Conduct which have come down in the youthful handwriting of George Washington. Some early biographers held that these rules were compiled by George Washington himself. Recent opinion inclines to the view that they were copied by him from an original provided by his schoolmaster, based on the mature system of some European teacher. Whatever their origin, they are sufficient proof that the young man had instruction in manners and ethics, in addition to the daily readings in religious devotions practised by his mother. A comparison of George Washington's behavior convinces one that he profited by these teachings and conformed in a remarkable degree to their demands. Another who is interesting in this regard is Benjamin Franklin. There is no reason to believe that Franklin had special ethical teaching beyond that of the usual Puritan home and school; though he probably read in his early manhood essays in this field by the French humanists. He produced a good deal of original material of an ethical nature, much of which reached the people through his *Poor Richard's Almanac*. On the whole, we may say, that while education has gained much in spread since the period which we are studying and vastly more knowledge of the world in which we live is included, it has lost in the moral and ethical quality which was maintained for the few who did receive an education. This is perhaps the greatest single neglected field in American life.

¹ Morse, John T. Jr., *John Quincy Adams*, p. 13ff. He attended schools for short periods in Amsterdam, Leyden, and Paris, and was secretary to Francis Dana at St. Petersburg, at fourteen.

² Howe, M. A. DeWolfe, *George Bancroft*, vol. I, p. 22, p. 24ff.

³ Barrows, John Henry, *Henry Ward Beecher*, p. 40. "Had he remained much longer in Boston, he would have plunged into moral ruins." See also, Abbott, Lyman, *Henry Ward Beecher*, p. 32.

⁴ Thwaites, Reuben Gold, *Daniel Boone*, p. 10. "Sarah Day, an intelligent young Quakeress who had more education than was customary in the neighborhood. Sarah taught Daniel the elements of the 'three R's.' "

⁵ Much new light is thrown on the character and training of Patrick Henry in the new biography by George Morgan. It is evident that the traditional picture of the idle and undisci-

plined youth had its origin not so much in fact as in the jealous imagination of Thomas Jefferson.

⁶ Benjamin West, a native of Pennsylvania, long a resident of London, and one of the outstanding artists of his times, might well be considered for the Hall of Fame. He was the master who taught three of its members, Stuart, Fulton and Morse.

⁷ Details of all of these cases are given at the appropriate place in each of the biographical sketches concerned.

⁸ An interesting field for further investigation would be a study of the tutors imported by wealthy Southerners to teach in their homes. Practically all those encountered in this study were Scotsmen and ministers. Presumably at home they were Presbyterians. In Virginia the Episcopal church was established (without bishops), and there was sharp persecution at times against Presbyterians and other sectaries. The indications are that these ministers who were imported as tutors belonged to the established Presbyterian church in Scotland; and that in the colonies they followed the establishment rather than Presbyterianism. See Morgan, *Patrick Henry*, p. 23, for an example in the Reverend Patrick Henry, uncle of Patrick, the orator.

⁹ Johnson, W. F., *The Life of William Tecumseh Sherman*, p. 571.

¹⁰ Hitchcock, Edward, *The Life and Labors of Mary Lyon*, p. 56. Frances E. Willard, *Autobiography*, p. 112. Fields, Annie, *Harriet Beecher Stowe*, p. 52-53. Mary Lyon instituted somewhat the same procedure among her students at Mt. Holyoke. Such was her self-sacrificing devotion to the institution, and her contagious love of her students, that few negative results are discoverable; rather she inspired a like devotion in the lives of a large proportion of the young women who came under her influence, which may be classed as religious and character education of a very high order.

¹¹ Stewart, George, *A History of Religious Education in Connecticut*, p. 67, quoting Mather, Cotton, *Magnalia*, (Ed. 1853) Vol. II, p. 179. Ethical teachings among the Puritans were largely based upon the Ten Commandments, and were in the form of catechisms, which were very generally taught. Cotton Mather mentions, in the passage above referred to, eleven authors of such catechisms, and says: "Few pastors of mankind ever took such pains at catechising, as have been taken by our New England divines."

CHAPTER VII.

HIGHER EDUCATION OF FAMOUS
AMERICANS

Higher Education of Famous Americans

<i>Intellectual Record</i>		<i>Discipline</i>	
Excellent	24	Excellent	31
Moderate	8	Moderate	2
Poor	2	Poor	2
No information	4	No information	3
<hr/>		<hr/>	
38		38	

Activities

Participated	14
Did not participate	10
No information	14
<hr/>	
38	

Profession in Which Pre-eminent

	<i>College Education</i>	<i>Apprentice Type</i>	<i>Self- education</i>	
Actor		1		
Artist		2		
Author	9		4	
Engineer		1		
Historian	2			
Inventor	2		1	
Lawyer and Statesman or Judge	10	2	2	
Minister	5			
Philanthropist	1		1	
Scientist	3		4	
Teacher	3		2	
Warrior	3		1	
Warrior-Statesman			1	
	—	—	—	
Totals	38	6	16	60

No higher education	3
<hr/>	
63	

	<i>College Attended</i>	<i>Graduated</i>
Harvard	13	13
Yale	4	3
William and Mary	2	1
Williams	2	2
Dartmouth	2	2
West Point	4	3
Bowdoin	2	2
	—	—
Totals	29+9	26+9
	=38 attended; =35 graduated.	

One each attended: Amherst, Princeton, Virginia (Duplicate), Fairfield Medical, Heidelberg, Brown, Evanston, Columbia, Michigan, Cambridge (England).

Higher Education of Famous Americans

Criteria

IN these studies *higher education* denotes college or its equivalent. College education is treated as a sufficiently clear term in itself, although the colleges of a century ago are difficult to compare with the same or other colleges of today. Study of an artist in a European *atelier* over an equal period of years as would be required for a college degree is considered as an equivalent. By an excellent or brilliant record is meant *summa cum laude*, *cum laude*, Phi Beta Kappa, or an equivalent. A *moderate scholastic record* is average, leading naturally to a degree. A *poor scholastic record* is one where discipline was required to try to bring the student's standing up to average.

Discipline in college, as here used, denotes self-discipline or self-control. Those classed *excellent* did not come into collision with disciplinary authority. Those classed *moderate* had some minor difficulties with the college authorities, which were adjusted. Those classed *poor* were expelled from college.

No special criteria are necessary for consideration of the ill-assorted college activities of the times; while the tabulation for professional training is also self-explanatory. By college attended is meant the original college at which undergraduate work was done. Several carried on graduate studies, chiefly abroad, some of them at several colleges. No tabulation of such graduate studies was made, as there seemed little chance of a valuable comparison.

College Attended.

Thirty-eight of the sixty-three in the Hall of Fame attended college, of whom thirty-five graduated with one or more degrees. Thirteen attended and graduated from Harvard. Yale is next with four entered and three graduated; West Point the

same. Two each attended Williams, William and Mary, Dartmouth, and Bowdoin. One each, Amherst, Brown, Columbia, Evanston College for Women, Fairfield Medical, Michigan, Princeton, Virginia (a duplicate) Heidelberg (Germany) and Cambridge (England). The outstanding position of Harvard is notable. This seems to have some connection with the type of people from which the institution drew both its faculty and its students.

Scholastic Records.

Of these thirty-eight there were 24 who made excellent or brilliant scholastic records; 8 moderately good, 2 poor and 4 no information. In the field of discipline or behavior the figures are 31 excellent, 2 moderate, 2 poor, and 3 no information. The two with poor records in both scholarship and behavior are the same, and both were in the field of imaginative literature,—Poe and Cooper. Poe left the University of Virginia and West Point with none too good a record in either case.¹ Cooper paid little attention to studies at Yale; he roamed the forests and shores, and left by request in his Junior year, "as the result of some boyish prank."² How serious this was is not told.

Behavior Record.

There is a very high correlation between excellent scholarship and an excellent behavior record. The 24 who ranked excellent in studies all ranked excellent also in conduct. Sherman is on the ragged edge in both. But there were six whose conduct seems to have been entirely satisfactory who were only moderately good students. Motley was rusticated for poor scholarship, but later returned and made Phi Beta Kappa. Parkman, another Historian, read what he liked and paid little attention to his professors.³ Eli Whitney was a fair student but more interested in making physical apparatus for scientific experiments than in high marks in literary courses. There were, therefore, reasons why these six men, who afterwards succeeded so pre-eminently, were not particularly interested in their studies. It is a fact which needs interpretation

that the men afterwards distinguished in history and literature either did not go to college or were little interested in the literary subjects offered at college. Bancroft is perhaps the only exception to this generalization.⁴

Outside Activities.

The activities were chiefly of a literary and social nature. There were fourteen who participated, ten did not, fourteen yield no information. Such participation seems therefore to be a matter of taste and temperament, and not an important factor in later success or usefulness.

Professions and Professional Training.

In addition to the 38 with college training, 7 were apprenticed in professions (not trades) in acting, (1), art, (3), engineering (1) and law (2). One or two others might be thus classed, though it seemed more accurate to class them among the 16 who were self-educated. This latter group, the self-educated, includes four authors and four scientists, the rest scattering. Here again are pioneer, frontier conditions, in an educational rather than geographical sense. It is only two generations since engineering began to be taught as a part of a higher education, and the teaching of sciences (as against a very inadequate general consideration of natural philosophy) is almost equally recent.⁵ It lies outside the scope of this study to go into a detailed account of the "spread" of professional training. It is worth noting that except for the five ministers and three generals, most of the others got what professional training they ever got, by the apprentice or the trial and error method. Now practically all professions can be studied in some sort of college course,—though instruction is still inadequate in some of the fine arts.

Three of the group seem never to have received any "higher" education at all, unless one consider Daniel Boone's knowledge of wild beasts and red Indians as a higher education, or Elias Howe's practical knowledge of practical mechanics.

It is in large measure to the labors of the persons in this list that American education owes the rapid strides which it has made up to the present time. In the group are leading founders of educational institutions and educational administrators, such as Mark Hopkins, Horace Mann, Emma Willard, Alice Freeman and Mary Lyon. There are men in public life, like Jefferson and Madison, who promoted both popular and higher education.⁶ Then there are teachers who pioneered in scientific and professional education, including Agassiz, Gray, Joseph Henry, Maria Mitchell, Chancellor Kent and Joseph Story. Again there are public-spirited citizens who endowed educational institutions, such as Peabody and Peter Cooper. There are others that are difficult to classify, like Franklin, founder of the Philadelphia library, and of the institution that grew into the University of Pennsylvania, or Samuel F. B. Morse, artist, inventor, and founder of the American Academy. All of these were men and women of high character, brought up by devout parents, who in large measure dedicated their rare talents to the public good and thereby greatly enriched their country.

To be sure those whom Americans love to honor most, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Benjamin Franklin, had no formal higher education. They wrested their education largely by diligence and force of character from books and the processes of life. On the other hand, it is worthy of note that out of the 63 in the Hall of Fame, 38 entered college and 35 secured college degrees; that is, 60% entered college, 53% graduated, well over half of these Famous Americans, in a country where during the same period approximately only one in 800 of the population were college graduates. The chances of the college graduate of attaining such distinction were four hundred times as good as the non college graduate. In such calculations, of course, it must always be recognized that other factors enter in; as for example the fact that those who went to college were a highly selective group, from the best homes, with the best heredity, social heredity,

and moral and religious education. But when all due allowances are made, the case is still very excellent in favor of colleges,—and higher education, however secured.

¹ Griswold and other authorities have asserted that Poe was expelled from the University of Virginia. Gill, William T., *The Life of Edgar Allan Poe*, p. 33ff., quotes from President Maupin, and from William Wertenbaker, Secretary of the University, to the effect that, "he did not fall under the censure of the faculty." But Wertenbaker states that, "He had an ungovernable passion for card playing," which was the reason for his withdrawal from the university at the end of the first term. At West Point Poe was tried by court-martial on numerous charges for, "neglect of duty and disobedience of orders." He pleaded guilty and was cashiered *nem con.* Gill, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

² Lounsbury, Thomas R., *James Fenimore Cooper*, p. 8, "A frolic in which he was engaged during his third year was attended by consequences more serious than disfavor. It led to his dismissal." It is aggravating to have such important factors in the life of an individual covered up by a so-called biographer.

³ Farnham, Charles Haight, *A Life of Francis Parkman*, p. 74. "He was probably the first man in American colleges to follow an elective course and become a specialist." Parkman made a brilliant showing in those courses which interested him. Although he completely neglected other prescribed courses, he was not expelled. His elective course was not prescribed or permitted; it was put over by the same force of will which carried Parkman through other difficulties.

⁴ See Adams, Herbert B., *The Study of History in America*.

⁵ A claim is sometimes made that George Washington studied surveying, i.e., civil engineering, at William and Mary. The facts seem to be that he spent a few weeks in Williamsburg, then the seat of the British Colonial Governor, waiting for dispatches. While there he took advantage of the presence of the college to make some enquiries concerning the mathematical knowledge necessary for a practical surveyor.

⁶ Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe together were founders of the University of Virginia. All three had advanced ideas on education, and Jefferson in particular anticipated by one hundred years some important educational theories. These can be best studied in the minute book kept in Thomas Jefferson's own handwriting as chairman of the board of the University of Virginia.

CHAPTER VIII.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF FAMOUS
AMERICANS

Religious Education

Religion in the home

1. Strict, puritanical	24
2. Deeply religious, not over strict	28
3. Moderately religious, liberal	9
4. No interest	1
5. Insufficient information (Audubon)	1
	63

Religious instruction in school or with tutor

1. Strict, devout, great amount	27
2. Moderate religious atmosphere	12
3. Meager schooling, or little rel. in school	13
4. Insufficient information	11
	63

Type of religion in church attended during childhood

1. Strictly Puritan, or father Calvinist minister	30
2. Moderate, actively evangelical	19
3. Coldly intellectual	2
4. Mixed experience, i.e., Catholic-Protestant, orphan adopted, (successful, 2; unsuccessful 5)	7
5. Insufficient information	5
	63

Church membership

1. A church member	36
2. Not a church member	15
3. Insufficient information	12
	63

Type of religious experience

1. Mystic, psychic, twice-born type	13
2. Deeply devout, once-born type	26
3. No known religious experience (negative evidence)	6
4. Religious experience not noted	18
	63

Religious Education of Famous Americans

Criteria

THERE are two elements that enter into the classification on *Religion in the Home* as decisive characteristics, one qualitative and the other quantitative. The first class we have called *Strict Puritanical*. The qualitative character is one of strictness, of exactitude, of discipline for discipline's sake. It is based upon a world-view of a closed and finished universe, where final knowledge and exact standards of righteousness have been revealed. The true Puritan and the Calvinist who took his religion seriously had this strict view of life. It was a point of view induced by a severe theology, and brought a sense of finality to those who accepted it. This sense of *finality with its accompanying strictness marks* the first class. The second class, *Deeply Religious*, often appears on the surface much like the first. But the fundamental difference is one of quality. The basic element here is one of religious devotion, tempered by love and mellowed by faith. The fear element plays a minor rôle, or does not enter at all, and no matter how much preached, it does not take root. To those who have and teach this type of religion, discipline is a means to an end, life is good, and God's world to be used, enjoyed, but not abused. Amongst those under strict Puritan discipline individuals or families of this sort are sometimes found. The difference between the second and the third group is more one of quantity than of quality. The third group, *moderately religious or liberal* have much the same reactions and point of view on the fundamental issues of life; the chief difference is the part that religious expression plays in their lives. Elements of temperament may enter in, but it is largely a matter of circumstances and experience. With this third group, religion has a distinct and definite place in their lives, but it does not occupy the

whole foreground or saturate all actions and motive of life.

In the area of *religion in the school*, the first group covers approximately the same ground as the first two in the home. For pupils had different teachers and attended different schools, and only the total impression, whether it was fundamentally and predominantly religious, or only moderately so, can be set down. A third and considerable group are those who had *meager schooling* or too little religion in school for it to have been an effective force. The final group is, of course, those about whom there is *insufficient information*.

As regards the *religion taught in the church*, the first group constitutes the strict and the deeply devout, as in the case of the school. The second also corresponds to the second in the school. A third small but essential group appears, in which there is religion and church attendance, but so intellectualized as to make little appeal to the emotional, artistic or philanthropic sides of life. There is neither the blare of a great ritual nor the activity of the institutional church and humanitarian service. Here also another and fourth class is found of mixed experience, in which the child was changed from the environment of one to another of two quite distinct ecclesiastical systems. In these cases there was at the same time a certain uprooting of home life, which must be taken into consideration.

Church membership is treated at length and with such detail in the text that special criteria need not be set up or the method of classification elaborated here. In *religious experience* the terms *once born* and *twice born* as used by William James in his *Varieties of Religious Experience* are sufficiently clear and well known to need no further explanation.

Religion in the Home.

As has been estimated in discussing the religion of parents, the religious atmosphere in the homes of these Americans played an important rôle in their character development. Some information on this subject is available in the case of all but

one of the homes under consideration, a statement which can be made relative to but few of the questions raised in this study. There are four classifications, 1. *Strict Puritanical*, 2. *Deeply religious homes, not over-strict*, 3. *Moderately religious, liberal homes*, and 4. *Homes where there was no interest in religion*.

Over-strict, Puritanical Homes.

In 7, possibly 8 of the 24 homes classed as strict, what are now known as "Puritanical" views had a markedly negative effect upon the children. This effect was of two sorts, theological and social. In some of these cases the resentment felt in later years against the theological doctrines of total depravity and eternal damnation, which maturity and a more enlightened age rejected, was severe. This was true in the cases of Benjamin Franklin, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Horace Mann. In other cases the resentment was against a strict discipline based on the religious tenets, which brought about unpleasant associations in the minds of the children toward religion. There were some eighteen cases where the religious discipline might be judged over-strict today, yet in which there were not serious negative results, due in part perhaps to the affectionate behavior of the parents.

If parents and religious teachers understood more of the bonds of association in learning, offenses against childhood in the name of religion might be greatly reduced. A far less number of young people would have minds set against religious expression. There was an anti-religious complex of this sort in the minds of Maria Mitchell and Mark Twain. The negative theological reaction is the more serious of the two, as against religion itself, than that against discipline in the enforcement of social custom. A few, like Mark Twain, were negatively affected on both counts.

In cases where there was a strong bond of love between parents and child, as there was in the case of Frances Willard, the resentment was neither deep nor lasting, and satisfactory adjustments were soon made.

There is noticeable in the study of these lives, generation by generation, a constant tendency toward more liberal and humanitarian views on religion throughout the entire list and the whole period under review. In most of the cases studied the liberalization came to the individual in the process of growing up, without serious emotional disturbance; a few of the subjects comment upon the religious training of their childhood with considerable asperity.

On this subject Oliver Wendell Holmes writes, "My father felt that he did his duty in expecting my mother to hear me recite the shorter Westminster Catechism. My mother, like a faithful wife as she was, sobered her pleasant countenance and sat down to hear us recite of 'justification,' 'adoption,' and 'sanctification', and the rest of the program. We learned nominally that we were a set of little fallen wretches, exposed to the wrath of God by the fact of that existence which we could not help."¹

"Scott's Family Bible and the Pilgrim's Progress represent 'the Universe as a trap which catches most of the human vermin that have its bait dangled before them'. . . . The truest revelation, it seems to me, is that influx of knowledge brought about by astronomy, geology, and a comparative study of the creeds."²

"What is to become of the reason of a child taught to repeat, and to believe that he believes, the monstrous absurdity which he reads in the lines of the New England Primer:

'In Adam's fall
We sinned all'?

Doctrines like that, introduced into the machinery of a young intelligence break the springs, poison the fountains, dwarf the development, ruin the harmony, disorganize the normal mechanism of the thinking powers."³

Maria Mitchell recounts that, her father being a strict Quaker, a piano was not allowed in the home, as being worldly. She and her sisters secured one and kept it for a time at a neighbor's. Finally when her father was away, the piano

was brought in. After very mild remonstrance, he made no further objection.⁴

Frances Willard was denied novels, dancing, theatre, and cards on religious grounds. Reading was limited to the Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, and a few like books. Though the family lived on a frontier farm, and there was scant opportunity for church going, Sunday was largely given over to singing hymns and memorizing the Bible. The day she was eighteen she declared her independence. She openly read a novel in her father's presence. He ordered her to put it away. She replied that she had done as he thought best until she was eighteen. Now she would do as she herself thought best.⁵ Yet these were not turned seriously against religion or moral conduct, and all except Mark Twain made satisfactory adjustments.

Deeply religious homes, not over strict.

In the largest group of homes represented in these studies religion played an important and central part. Grace at table, family worship and regular religious instruction were the rule rather than the exception. In homes of this type there was an atmosphere of faith, joy and exuberant life. Such homes shade off toward the liberal side, but 28 of these homes are classed as deeply religious but not over strict.

Louis Agassiz was descended from six generations of Huguenot clergymen in the direct paternal line. There were daily family prayers in the home, which were considered a joy rather than a duty. Louis, therefore, during his student days at Heidelberg, writes his father that he always tries to pray at the same hour each day at which the family devotions are held. On the other hand the children of the Agassiz home were encouraged to outdoor sports, such as skating and mountain climbing, and in the love and study of nature. Games and festivals were enjoyed in the home, and there were few negative restrictions.⁶

The home of George Bancroft was deeply devotional yet not extremely strict. His father, a Congregational minister

who later became a Unitarian, was described as even-tempered, kindly and brilliant. The congregation said of him, "If we find fault with him, he does not mind it; if we praise him he does not mind it. So we decided to let him alone." His mother was, "brilliant, care-free, pleasure-loving,—by nature fond of novels and plays," yet in practice, careful, devoted, thrifty, as became the wife of a poor minister of a large family. Theirs was a truly happy home, approaching very near to the ideal, and it is little wonder that George wished to follow in his father's footsteps.

Moderately religious, liberal homes.

There are nine homes that may be classed as moderately religious and liberal. Among these is found the home of James Fenimore Cooper, who was descended from Quaker stock on his father's side. But James Cooper, Sr., adopted the religion of his wife, Elizabeth Fenimore, who was an Episcopalian. As landed proprietor and founder of Cooperstown, he built an Episcopal church in the village. James, Jr., was allowed great liberty to roam the woods, to enjoy all ordinary pleasures, but attended worship with the family and was sent to a church school in Albany.⁷ He grew up to become himself a vestryman, and an active supporter of the church.

Another typical example was the home of James Madison, whose father was a Virginia tobacco planter in comfortable circumstances. Both his parents were Episcopalians, the established form of religion at that time in Virginia. James, however, was sent to Princeton, a Presbyterian college, where he began the study of Hebrew, looking toward entering the Christian ministry. This had to be abandoned, owing to his poor health. Later he was able to take up the study of the law at home, though his health was always delicate. For many years the family lived out of reach of an Episcopal church; they attended therefore and supported the local Presbyterian church, of which Madison was an officer.⁸

Both the parents of George Washington were religious.

His mother is described as, "wise, prudent, idealistic, devoted to the truth." She read much in books on religion, ethics, and devotions. There was a distinct religious atmosphere in the home, and the family attended worship, both public and private, yet there was little repression about this home. Dancing, fox-hunting, and all the sports of the countryside were enjoyed by the sons of the family.

No interest in religion.

The only home classed, so far as our records go, as without religious interest, was that of Edgar Allen Poe, if Poe can be said to have had a home, prior to his adoption. Yet the mother of Poe, if more facts were known of her, would probably be found to have been not unreligious—witness the lovely statue of her in St. James Churchyard, in Richmond, Virginia. The Allens, who, upon her death, adopted her talented son into their home in Richmond, were nominal Episcopalians; but the church seems to have played no important part in their lives.

Religious instruction in school or with tutor.

Religious instruction in school runs fairly closely parallel to that to be found in the homes of the young people her studied. In 27 cases religious instruction in the school attended was strict or a central motivating force as compared with 24 homes strictly religious. This subject has already been discussed at several other points, where, for example, it has been pointed out that in a number of cases the father was also the minister and the teacher, thus giving a unified approach to the child's education. Also deeply religious parents either sent their children to schools which reflected their own point of view religiously, or developed that type of school for their children. In fact, the Puritan and Protestant principle of education for their children is the root out of which popular education has grown in America. Religious instruction in schools founded by such parents was taken as a matter of

course; too much as a matter of course. For such parents, however high their idealism, knew little of the laws of learning. In all too many cases it was taken for granted that memorizing the Catechism and Scripture passages would produce religion in the life of the child.

In many cases no details are given regarding the actual procedure of religious instruction in the schools attended, though it is known that there was such instruction, either by inference or by direct statement. For example, the principal of the academy at Windsor, New York, to which Alice Freeman went, was the pastor of the Presbyterian church of which she was a member; and the assistant teacher, to whom she became engaged for a time, was a theological student from one of the seminaries; religious instruction may be safely taken for granted in such an academy, but details are wanting in available biographies.⁹ On the other hand, Mary Lyon goes into great detail regarding the evangelistic zeal of the young minister in the school which she attended. The religion there represented was of the twice-born type, and it was the inspiration there received which led Mary Lyon to the founding of Mount Holyoke Seminary. She carried the same spirit and point of view into her educational program, a devotion which has not altogether disappeared from Mount Holyoke College to this day.¹⁰

In general it may be said that those homes which were strictly religious sent their children to school where a similar religious spirit prevailed, or provided tutoring at home of a like sort. In the older academies and church schools, the day's work almost without exception opened with a hymn, Bible reading, and prayer; in very many of them there was additional religious instruction, sometimes in the form of memory work, sometimes in the form of personal evangelism, such as has been referred to in the case of Mary Lyon, in the school of the Reverend Mr. Emerson at Londonderry. As the tax-supported public schools developed, religious instruction tended steadily to decrease. In the older Eastern states this was reduced to the

singing of a hymn and Bible reading, which custom still prevails in many regions in the East. As one goes further West, or comes toward modern times, these "opening exercises" are gradually eliminated, to the vanishing point, as in Oregon, where a law has been passed but not upheld, prohibiting all private schools, and California, where the Bible is not allowed by state law to be placed upon the shelves of public school libraries.

Type of religion in the church attended during childhood.
Calvinist or Puritan.

Of the 30 who attended a Calvinist or Puritan church during childhood, eleven were the sons or daughters of ministers, hence they had much the same moral and religious atmosphere in church that they had at home. They might be said to have had a double dose of Calvinism. A few even got a triple dose, as in addition to having the same person for father and minister, the child was also chiefly educated at home, or the father was the school teacher.

Jonathan Edwards' father, the Reverend Timothy, was a graduate of Harvard and minister at East Windsor, Connecticut for sixty years. There Jonathan was born in 1703. Not only did he have the influence of his scholarly, deeply spiritual father in the home, the father also took in young men to tutor, of whom his son was, of course, one. And his father was the minister of the parish church, where the services were carried on with extreme decorum and punctilious attention to detail. Jonathan had ten sisters, no brothers. He spent much time alone, loved and studied nature. At eleven he wrote a treatise on the soul, and entered Yale at twelve.¹¹

Moderate, actively evangelical.

Phillips Brooks is an excellent example of training in a moderate but evangelical church, there being 19 cases so classed. The parents had gone to First (Unitarian) Church, Boston, founded by an ancestor, John Cotton. Its pastor at

that time, Dr. Frothingham, was a relative. But Brooks' mother was dissatisfied with the cold, intellectual atmosphere and she transferred to St. Paul's Episcopal church, of which the venerable Dr. Vinton was then and for many years rector. He was of "the Evangelical school, enforcing the atonement of Christ as the supreme doctrine of the gospel." The atmosphere of this church had a peculiar attraction for Brooks, and Dr. Vinton played an important part in his life.¹²

An interesting case is that of Washington Irving, whose father was a strict Presbyterian, his mother before her marriage an Episcopalian. Young Washington, fearing that he, too, might have to become a Calvinist, slipped off at an early age and got himself confirmed by the Episcopal bishop. The church of his choice suited better his temperament, and he remained actively interested in it for the rest of his life.

Coldly Intellectual.

There are but two thus classed. One is Nathaniel Hawthorne. In a large, two-volume biography, written by his son, Julian, there is scarcely any mention of the church. Nathaniel showed himself deeply spiritual, by his life and by his writings. He deemed, "the cultivation and improvement of the intellect to be mainly selfish and instinctive; whereas goodness of character was the result of a purely Christian and regenerated effort."¹³ Yet it is only by the most careful reading of this extensive biography that one gleans incidentally that Hawthorne was married and buried by a Unitarian minister.

Mixed Experience.

There are seven cases which were classed as mixed, perhaps eight. For example, the father of St. Gaudens, the sculptor, was a French shoemaker who wandered to Dublin, where he married Mary McGuinness, a devout Irish Catholic who worked in the shoe shop. They later migrated to America. Bernard St. Gaudens, the father, would have nothing to do with the church. He was a Mason, and when he learned that

the lodge of which he was a member would not admit Negroes, he withdrew and joined a Negro lodge. With two such contrasting points of view represented by his parents, there is justification for classing St. Gaudens' boyhood experience with the church as mixed. St. Gaudens himself thereafter had little if any relationship with any form of organized religion, though his representation in marble of Jesus as the Christ shows deep religious feeling and understanding.

Another representative of this class is General William T. Sherman, who came of old New England Puritan stock, but on the death of his father was adopted into a Roman Catholic home. He later married a daughter of that home, and one of his sons became a Roman Catholic priest. Sherman never became a Roman Catholic, nor was he an active Protestant. The question of the church seems to have been a source of disharmony in his life. From the point of view of organized religion five of the seven cases of mixed experience may be classed as unsuccessful. There are six cases in which no information is readily available as to the type of church attended during childhood.

Church Membership.

Thirty-six of the sixty-three were members of some church. This may or may not be taken as a matter of significance. The standards of church membership varied considerably at different times, and somewhat with different organizations. The doctrinal standards for membership have certainly become less strict during the past century, which may in part account for the rising *percent* of membership in the total population. Exact statistics of population and church membership during the Colonial period are impossible to secure. Such facts as are available have been gathered and they are in strong contrast to the popular notion of the good old days and the dying condition of the church today. In fact, a steady increase in *percent* of church membership in relation to total population is noted throughout the period. Sufficiently accurate figures on

population and church membership have been secured to give us a real basis for comparison of the attitude of those in the Hall of Fame to the church, with the attitude of the total population to the church.

In order to analyze the situation and see if there is a drift or tendency, the cases have been divided into three groups:

(1) Those born up to 1780, the median year of their lives being also 1780.

(2) Those born after 1780 and up to 1810, a thirty year period or one generation.

(3) The remainder, all but two of whom were born by 1840.

It happened that these three groups were of commensurate size. The figures are given in the appendix, pages 202-204, where tables and estimates from various authorities will be found.

From these figures it appears that in the period up to 1780, when church membership was approximately 7% of the total population, between 62% and 72% of those chosen for the Hall of Fame were church members. The next period, 1780 to 1810, shows 9% for the country at large, and between 64% and 76% in the Hall of Fame who were church members. The third period shows a marked rise in church membership for the country to 16%, with a drop to between 41% and 58% for the Hall of Fame. The average of all members of the Hall of Fame is 55% church members, or eliminating the unknown group, 70%, as against approximately 12% church members for the whole country over the whole period.

Just what all these figures prove is another question. Perhaps one may go so far as to say that there is a close relationship between achievement and successful leadership on one hand, and participation in organized religion on the other. It followed that those who so participated secured the privileges of education for their children, and later extended the same privileges to the population at large. As education

spread, church membership increased, and the high percentages in the table tended to decrease.

The basis for the figures on church membership at the time of the Revolution is a table given by the Reverend Robert Baird, D. D., in his *Religion in America*. He gives all the denominations with the number of ministers and churches, totaling 1461 ministers and 1970 churches. He quotes also from an address of the Reverend Ezra Stiles, D. D., before the Congregational clergy of Rhode Island, April 23, 1760, in which he estimated 530 Congregational churches, with 60,000 to 70,000 communicants, or about 122 per church.¹⁴ From other figures by Baird, and from those of Reed, it would appear that Stiles' figures are high. Reed gives 300 Presbyterian churches, with 20,000 members, or an average of 66 per church, and corresponding estimates for other denominations.¹⁵ Using Reed's figures one would get approximately 5% of the population members of any church at the time of the Revolution.

After weighing all the evidence, including early census reports, a compromise figure was adopted at an average of 100 members per church (probably well above the actual figure), which gives 7% of the population of 2,640,000 church members at the time of the Revolution.¹⁶ The population figures are taken from Seeman's *Essays on the Progress of the Nations*.¹⁷

For the next period various factors influence the growth of church membership—education, stabilization in some regions, immigration and spreading frontiers. By 1820 the *percent* of church membership had risen to approximately ten percent, so that it could not have been far from 9% in 1810. The official government census figures are available for 1850. From the *Compendium of the United States Census* for 1850, one learns that there were 2,456,965 Protestants, and 1,173,700 Roman Catholics, counted as church members in 1850, a total of 3,630,665, with a population of 23,191,876.¹⁸ This gives a church membership of 16% in 1850. By 1910 the church

membership reached 40% of the total population, and today it is slightly higher.

For the final figures of the whole number, note that the average year of birth of the 63 was 1788. The average year of death was 1858, giving an average length of life of exactly 70 years. The median year of birth was 1797 and the median year of death was 1867, which gives also a median length of life of 70 years. The middle point of the average life was 1823. The middle point of the median was 1832. If therefore the *percent* of church membership rose steadily to 16% in 1850, the church membership was between 12% and 13% for the average or median of the whole list for the whole period.

Church Members.

Examples of church members include of course the ministers themselves, such as Edwards, Beecher, and Brooks; they include also a number of men and women whose whole lives centered in and revolved about their religion, such as John Quincy Adams, who for sixty years spent an hour or more each morning at his personal devotions; Horace Mann, who declared his central purpose to be, "to know and to do the will of God"; Mary Lyon, whose every letter is full of such expressions as, ". . . Bringing the thoughts into captivity to the will of Christ";¹⁹ and Alice Freeman Palmer, of whom her husband writes, during her presidency at Wellesley, "In simple language she spoke to God as one who had known God."²⁰

Not Church Members.

Among the fifteen non-members, are ten who expressed themselves as being distinctly Christian, but for one reason or another—chiefly the illiberality of the church of their day or region, never officially joined the church. Daniel Boone spoke of, "being on his way in Christianity." Choate attended and "often expressed approval of those who joined a church." Franklin was critical of the church, but developed his own

ritual of worship. Hamilton asked for communion on his deathbed. Longfellow, Lincoln, and Maria Mitchell maintained and occupied church pews. John Marshall was a devoted Christian but rejected the "physical interpretation of the divinity of Christ."

Of the remaining six, Mark Twain was agnostic, caustically critical of the church, but in speaking of the death of his daughter expressed spiritual aspirations; Eads was "a free thinker"; Parkman was critical but distinctly religious; Poe was a Theist, who wrote in his *Eureka*, "Man will at length attain that awfully triumphant epoch when he shall recognize his existence as that of Jehovah."²¹ Peter Cooper seems to have been a Unitarian and St. Gaudens in his maturer years expressed a deep religious faith in his statues of the Christ, "Tender, yet firm; strong yet suffering."

Insufficient information.

Of the twelve who are marked as "insufficient information," several expressed themselves as devoutly Christian. Were all the facts known, their *percent* of church membership would probably not vary greatly from those about whom there is complete information.

Type of religious experience

In this section one is on difficult ground for accurate scientific classification.

Mystical, twice-born type.

Thirteen of the 63 have been classed as of the mystical, twice-born type. Among these is Harriet Beecher Stowe, who experienced an irruptive conversion, and later wrote, "I didn't write Uncle Tom's Cabin, God gave it, I wrote it down." In the case of her brother, Henry Ward Beecher, there is an analogous temperament and experience. Mary Lyon agonized over her salvation, and expected a like type of conversion in others. Jonathan Edwards notes a mystical experience of the

presence of God which first came to him when a lad. In none of the thirteen cases is there noted a psychic experience or phenomena so strong as, say, the experience of Jeanne d'Arc.

Deeply devout, once born type.

There are 26 who have been thus classed. These are lives where the biographical material is sufficiently full, detailed and intimate to give every reasonable expectation that any marked psychic experience would have been mentioned had it occurred. Yet such is the intimacy of experiences of this sort that some people scarcely if ever mention them. One or two may therefore have been passed over in silence. Typical of this class of deeply religious but unemotional people are the scientific men, such as Agassiz and Gray.

No religious experience.

Six of the subjects show definitely negative reactions. Among these are Mark Twain, Poe, perhaps Maria Mitchell. The latter declares, "There is a God and he is Good, I say to myself, I try to increase this, my only article of creed." In the cases of 18 others, a rather larger number than found in relation to most of the questions, the information is not sufficient for a decision. This is no doubt due to reticence in many cases. Not a few who gave expression to their faith by church membership or religious activity fail to express themselves as to the type of religious experience they may have had.

Summary.

A close relationship exists between the type of religion in the home and the type of character produced. It seems also evident that a close coordination in the type of religion in the home, the church, and the school is important. Mixed religious experience does not produce a high percentage of successful results. There is a constantly rising percentage of church membership throughout the period, also a rapid spread

of popular education, but a corresponding secularization of education. A far larger percent of church members have attained distinction than of the population at large; to some extent this may be due to education as a common factor; the character forming factor of religious instruction also seems to be an important one. Marked or extreme forms of religious experience are rare among these successful Americans; yet a very large percent of them show in various ways a positive reaction to a religious experience which includes a sense of the belief in or presence of God in their lives.

¹ Morse, John T. Jr., *Life and Letters of Oliver Wendell Holmes*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1896, p. 38.

² *Op. cit.* p. 43.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 45.

⁴ Kendall, Phebe Mitchell, *Maria Mitchell*, Boston, Lee and Shepard, 1896, p. 12.

⁵ Willard, Frances E. *Autobiography*, Chicago, H. J. Smith & Co., 1899, p. 72.

⁶ Agassiz, Elizabeth, *Louis Agassiz*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1897, Chap. I.

⁷ Phillips, Mary E., *James Fenimore Cooper*, New York, John Lane and Company, 1913, Chap. I.

⁸ Gay, Sidney Howard, *James Madison*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1890, p. 11ff.

⁹ The writer has visited Windsor, has talked with the present owner of the old Freeman home, and with a former pastor of the Windsor church—both resident there for a good many years. Facts as to religious instruction in Windsor Academy could certainly be established, had one the time to carry such investigations further.

¹⁰ Mary Lyon, *The Power of Christian Benevolence*, New York, American Tract Society, 1858, p. 28ff.

¹¹ Allen, Alexander V. G., *Jonathan Edwards*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1890, Chap. I.

¹² Allen, Alexander V. G., *Phillips Brooks*, New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1907, Chap. I.

¹³ Hawthorne, Julian, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and his Wife*, Boston, James R. Osgood and Company, 1885, vol. I, p. 42.

¹⁴ Baird, Robert, *Religion in America*, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1856, p. 210.

¹⁵ Reed, *History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World*, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1917, p. 250ff.

¹⁶ Alexander, F. W., *Stratford and the Lees*, Virginia Historical Society, 1912, p. 90. He quotes from the diary of John Adams for September 3, 1774, where Adams gives an account of breakfasting with Dr. Shippen, Dr. Witherspoon, and Colonel Richard Henry Lee. He says that Colonel Lee "Took his pen and attempted a calculation of the number of people represented by the Congress, which he made about two million and two hundred thousand." It is probable that Lee would not consider Negro slaves as people represented by the Congress.

¹⁷ Seeman, *Essays on the Progress of the Nations*, New York, Charles Scribners' Sons, 1852, pp. 579-583.

¹⁸ *Compendium of the United States Census*, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1850, p. 132ff.

¹⁹ Mary Lyon, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

²⁰ Palmer, George H., *The Life of Alice Freeman Palmer*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1910, p. 146.

²¹ Poe, Edgar Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

CHAPTER IX.

ADULT PERSONAL LIFE

Adult Moral and Religious Life

<i>Moral point of View</i>		<i>Religious Attitude</i>	
Extremely conscientious	47	Religion central	23
Moderately conscientious	8	Actively religious	21
A little lax	5	Passively approving	9
Lax	1	Opposed to Religion	4
No information	2	No information	6
Total	63	Total	63
<i>Attitude to Other Sex</i>		<i>Early Love Affairs</i>	
Exemplary	49	Unhappily terminated	14
A little questionable	6	None mentioned	46
Lax	3	No information	3
No information	5		
Total	63	Total	63
Divorced	1	<i>Marriage</i>	
Married Divorced person	1	Married	55
Married Widow	5	Remarried	13
Married Widower	2	Not married	8
Cared for nieces and nephews	11	(Men—4 Women—4	
(Including 7 unmarried and 4 childless)			—
			63
<i>Children</i>		<i>Treatment of Children</i>	
Large family	33	Very indulgent	4
Two or three	11	Devoted	31
One child	1	Kind but undemonstrative	4
No children	7	Very strict	1
No information	3	No information	15
Total	55	Total	55

Marriage

Happy	46
Neutral	4
Unhappy	2
No information	3
Total	55

Average number of children in families which had children 5
 Largest number 15

Attitude toward Prayer

Man or woman of prayer	43
Moderate practitioner	6
No practiser of prayer	3
No information	11
Total	63

Vocational Experience of Famous Americans

Of 16 who originally prepared for the Law
 10 in the main followed the Law and Government
 2 became distinguished as Historians
 1 became distinguished as Warrior
 2 became distinguished as Poets
 1 became distinguished as College President
 2 others are mentioned as having seriously considered or
 tried the Law.

Of the 9 who originally prepared for the Ministry
 5 became distinguished as Ministers
 2 became distinguished as Lawyers
 1 became distinguished as Historian
 1 became distinguished as Author
 3 others are mentioned as having seriously considered
 the Ministry.

Of the 6 who originally prepared for the Army or Navy
 4 became distinguished as Officers
 2 became distinguished as Authors
 1 mentioned as having seriously considered the Minis-
 try.

Of the 6 who originally prepared for Teaching
 3 became distinguished in the field of Education
 (College president, administrator)
 1 became distinguished in the field of Science
 1 became distinguished in the field of Invention

1 (Temperance reform) Philanthropy

A number of others taught temporarily to secure an Education.

Of the 5 who originally prepared for Medicine

1 became distinguished in the field of Medicine

1 became distinguished in the field of Literature

3 became distinguished as Teachers of Science.

Of the 5 who originally prepared for Fine Arts

2 became distinguished as Artists

2 became distinguished as Inventors

1 became distinguished as a Scientist

Of the 3 who originally prepared as Artisans

1 became distinguished as Inventor

1 became distinguished as Statesman and Scientist

1 became distinguished as Business man and Philanthropist.

The remaining 13 include a

Frontiersman who was distinguished as a Frontiersman

Poets who were distinguished as Poets

River pilot who was distinguished as an Author

Concert Singer who was distinguished as a Shakespearean Actress

Clerk who was distinguished as an Author and Consul

Scientist who was distinguished as a Scientist

Shopkeeper and farmer who was distinguished as a Lawyer and Orator

Business man who was distinguished as an Author

Merchant who was distinguished as a Banker and Philanthropist

Married woman who was distinguished as an Author

Planter who was distinguished as a General and Statesman.

Of the 63—33 show definite signs of occupational difficulty before they finally found their major ability or opportunity. The remainder either chose early or followed by definite progression into success.

Adult Moral and Religious Life of Famous Americans

Criteria

CRITERIA for *moral point of view* are: *extremely conscientious*, denotes a life in both theory and practise in harmony with Puritan demands, including exact honesty in financial matters, a strict standard of monogamy in sex for both men and women, speaking as nearly as possible the truth at all times, and a high sense of duty in affairs both public and private. The term *conscientious* is used to denote not a proven exact attainment of this standard, rather a sincere attempt to attain it in compliance with the demands of conscience. It does not necessarily imply that the subject went beyond the then current standard of moral excellence, in areas such as slavery, where clear cut moral distinctions had not yet been drawn, though most of them did do so in at least one area. *Moderately conscientious* denotes that the subject set for himself a lower standard than the above in not more than two of the four listed areas, but without a major moral break; e.g., Franklin's temporary use, for his own purposes, of money entrusted to his care, and his attempted justifying this to himself, which he afterwards "regretted." *Moderately Lax* denotes a more flagrant type of the same thing persisting in maturer years. *Lax* denotes a failure to set a high ethical standard throughout the list, when compared with either the Sermon on the Mount or the humanist moral philosophers.

Criteria for *Religious Attitude*, *Religion Central*, where the subject viewed all the major choices and activities of life from the point of view of his religious principles, as the major determining factor; *Actively Religious*, where the subject either avowedly gave to religion an important place in his personal life, or took an active part in religious organization, compa-

rable to civic, political, or educational activities; *Passively Approving*, those who expressed faith in a divine Intelligence or attended church, without taking any active part in furthering religious observances; *Opposed to Organized Religion*, those who expressed disapproval of church and religious activity either on intellectual or emotional grounds.

Criteria for *Attitude toward the other sex*, *Exemplary*, a high chivalry with thorough sublimation of sex impulse to affection and normal family life or the higher ends of society. *Questionable*, usually a normal sex control, but with occasional frayed edges or questionable conduct, which shows lack of idealism or inner harmony; *Lax*, definite and known breaches of the moral code, which could only come from a distorted attitude.

Early love affairs and marriage are definitely statistical and need no special criteria. In the *treatment of children*, the terms used were not such as to lend themselves to exact comparison with the treatment of the previous generation. *Very strict* is approximately the same as strict under the Puritan discipline of the previous generation. *Kind but undemonstrative* would indicate moderate discipline and kind treatment as before described, but without a close tie of affection. *Devoted* corresponds closely to moderate discipline, and kind treatment plus mutual understanding and affection. *Very Indulgent*, corresponds roughly to lax in the previous criteria for discipline, except that the laxity for the previous generation was more the laxity of frontier conditions, while the indulgence here described is the indulgence of successful and well-to-do homes, freed from the pinch of poverty. Again the married life of the sixty-three subjects is not described in the same terms as that of their parents. A fair basis of comparison is secured, however, by classing as *Happily Married*, those members of the Hall of Fame whose married state was similar to the marriage of parents classed as devoted or very devoted. The criteria for *Neutral* correspond roughly to "Moderately attached" for the previous generation; while *Unhappy* would cover the same

general conditions as overbearing, submissive, and bickering of the previous generation.

Adult Personal Life

Subjects.

Having discussed the childhood training of these important persons, and their social and physical heredity, it is necessary now to look with some care at the results in later life. What, if any, relation is found between the childhood stimuli and the adult responses? It may seem impertinent to classify them in regard to their moral point of view, but if this study is to be carried through, the attempt must be made.

Moral Point of View.

Sufficient evidence has been found to classify the subjects as extremely conscientious 47, moderately conscientious 8, moderately lax 5, lax 1, and no information 2. The 47 extremely conscientious show a high correlation with the 49 from strict and deeply religious homes. A few like Franklin, brought up over strictly, drop down a peg when it comes to conscience, and to relationship with the other sex. Franklin associated the enlarged world of thought which he entered on reading the French deists with freedom from moral restraint. He suffered, however, and caused others to suffer, as for example his illegitimate son and the woman who bore that son; so that both intellect and experience led him back in the direction of his Puritan upbringing. Franklin's later associations in England and France again somewhat modified his moral judgments, yet throughout, despite his fondness for beautiful ladies, there is always in the background the shadow of a New England conscience on guard. Benjamin Franklin is classed as moderately lax in moral point of view. On a scale of 5, say 1 as regards strictness of Puritan up-bringing, 3 in conscientiousness, and 3 in attitude towards religion; perhaps 4 in regard to women. Poe stands at the foot of the class in all grades.

Fifty-two of the 63 came from very strict or deeply religious homes, ranking themselves very strict, 24; deeply religious, 28; moderately interested, 9; no information, 1; and distinctly uninterested, 1. Fifty-one of the 52 who grew up in such religious homes rank class A or B in conscientiousness, the only delinquent being Franklin, who drops to Class C. Of these same 52 there are 43 who rank A or B in their interest in religion, where A stands for Religion Central in their lives, B actively religious in church and personal life,—those who drop down here being Franklin, Clemens, Clay, Mitchell, Motley, Parkman, and probably Fulton. Of the same 50, 48 rank A or B in so far as any records go, in their attitude towards the other sex. This gives the following correlations:

Religious training in the home with conscientiousness	+ .75
With adult activity and interest in religion	+ .77

In this classification the deeply religious but moderately liberal home ranks just about even with the extreme Puritan home in producing people of sensitive conscience, and continued interest in religion. Approximately the same figures hold also for a high sense of chivalry in attitude toward the other sex,—though the returns as recorded do not lend themselves to working out a mathematical correlation. There is noticeable all the way through a distinct drift as the years pass towards liberalism in religion and less discipline in the home, with only here and there a case, like that of J. Q. Adams who was more conservative theologically and more strict personally, than his father.¹

The strongest correlation encountered in the entire study is that between the moral and religious life in the home and the later moral and religious life of the adult. As has been pointed out elsewhere, the figures are not so complete for the church and the school. But since the conditions in the church and the school closely paralleled those in the home, particularly in colonial and early American times, before the advent of the public school and the growth of cities, much the same correlations appear. Parents attended or developed churches that suited their moral

and religious tastes, and they founded for their children, as far as they were able, schools of the same sort.

Early Love Affairs.

Since such prominence is given in some schools of psychology to the "libido" and the place of the sex instinct in life, it was thought worth while to record any facts that might emerge concerning early love affairs. In fourteen cases such affairs are mentioned, that terminated unhappily, or were broken off by death or mutual consent. In five of these cases the subject never married, in nine he or she did later marry. In 46 cases a detailed account of the life is available, but no such love affair is specially mentioned. In 3 the information is not sufficient to judge. In many of the 46 of course there were early love affairs, which usually blossomed into early marriage. Excellent examples of this are those of Channing and Sherman.² Early marriage was the rule, and there was little waiting about to complete educations or amass a fortune.

In so far as the records indicate, these early love affairs had a refining influence on those who experienced them. Some of them are well known to history and literature, and some have already been referred to in this study. George Washington's lowland beauty long held his fancy, and it was rather a matter of deliberate choice when he married Martha Custis.³ Alice Freeman as a school girl was engaged to a young theologian; the friendship meant much to her, but was outgrown.⁴ She later married Professor Palmer and found great happiness. Frances Willard had several passing fancies, and one real love affair of which she herself speaks. It was always a precious memory to her, though she never married and never told the details of the one affair.⁵ Washington Irving loved Matilda Hoffman. She died of tuberculosis at seventeen. He remained true to her memory all his life, and carried her Bible, her prayer book, and a lock of her hair always on his travels. He says, "I tried to form other attachments, but my heart would

not hold on." Additional well known examples are those of Lincoln and Madison.

The story is fairly well authenticated of George Peabody, the powerful Baltimore and London banker, falling in love with a fair New England lily. The lady at first consented to an engagement. But he learned that she really loved a village swain and had been sent abroad to break off the attachment. He sadly dismissed her, and devoted himself thereafter to charity and good works. One of the most touching stories is the love of Roger Williams for Jane Whalley. When Lady Barrington refused to allow him to see her niece he wrote her, "We hope to live together in the heavens though the Lord have denied that union on Earth." The high spirited young clergymen all but died of a brain fever following the break. Upon his recovery he married a girl of lesser rank and sailed almost immediately for the colonies. Roger Williams was naturally sensitive, and this affair of the heart seems to have tempered his character and to have deeply affected his career.

Marriage and Divorce.

Among the parents of the sixty-three subjects, there is but one case of divorce or separation, that of Rachel Fawcette, the mother of Alexander Hamilton, to which reference has already been made. The case of Audubon has already been considered in detail.

In the remainder of these sixty-one homes there are no breaks through "incompatibility," desertion or immorality. The parents in twenty-two cases are described as "very devoted," in sixteen as devoted, two as "moderately attached." In two cases the father was said to be overbearing and the mother submissive, and in two others there seems to have been bickering or quarreling, perhaps because the mother was not submissive. There are 18 additional cases which are still marked "insufficient information" as to how the parents got on with each other. But at least they got on, and from what is known about their homes and moral and religious life there

is no reason to believe that they were different from the 43 where the information is available. Among the one hundred twenty-four sets of grandparents, the available information gives about the same results. The one major difficulty is the parentage of Nancy Hanks, which is too widely discussed to need further consideration here. Otherwise there is no known major deviation from the marital standard among the grand parents.

Coming now to the sixty-three themselves elected to the Hall of Fame, 55 married, 8 did not, 4 men and 4 women. Thirteen, 12 of them widowers, 1 widow, remarried. There was in the entire group only one divorce—the case of the thirteenth, the elderly widow who made an ill considered second marriage. The man proved to be an unworthy adventurer, and the lady in question, Emma Hart, Mrs. Willard, was forced in self-defense without suspicion of evil on her part to seek a separation.⁷ The only other case of separation or divorce connected with the entire group, is that of Andrew Jackson who married Rachel Donelson, a young woman who had made an unfortunate marriage, and was separated, (but as Jackson later learned not fully divorced) from her husband. Though Jackson may be considered to have been careless as to the legal procedure, his motives and his personal conduct can not be seriously criticized. He and his wife were very happy and deeply devoted to the time of her death.⁸

Of the eight who never married, four men and four women, there is no whisper of scandal. The four women chose a life of service to humanity rather than the duties and responsibilities of a home. All four cared for and educated a brood of young people, generally nieces and nephews. (Charlotte Cushman, Maria Mitchell, Mary Lyon, Frances Willard). Much the same may be said of the four men who never married. (Phillips Brooks, Washington Irving, George Peabody, John Greenleaf Whittier.) Two of them, Irving and Peabody, are known to have had love affairs which ended unhappily—the same is

probable of the other two. All were men of exceptionally high and unblemished character.

It will be remembered that the fathers of 32 out of 63 were Puritans, the mothers of 30. It is safe to conclude therefore that Puritanism was successful in producing a high state of morality and a fine relationship between men and women, and that the Puritans produced at the same time men and women of abilities and attainments out of all proportion to their numbers. With no outstanding superiority of heredity or racial stock, a small group, mostly English and Scotch, of largely middle class people, produced more than half of America's most acclaimed poets, historians, statesmen, teachers, preachers and scientists.

Attitude Toward the Other Sex.

Regarding the attitude toward the other sex of these 56 men and 7 women,—49, including all the women, are described as "exemplary," 6 as questionable, 3 lax, and 5 no information. Possibly this total of 49 may need to be discounted somewhat, owing to secret escapades of youth that were never made known, the admiration of their subject by some biographers, and the eulogistic style generally in vogue. On the other hand, a relentless light of publicity was turned upon many of them; envy was incited by success and political mud was thrown. Some allowance must therefore be made on the other side, for slander and false accusation. And after making any reasonable allowance, it is found that these characters have a remarkably high record for purity of life and conduct.

It were perhaps better not to further elaborate cases of moral lapses and indiscretions,—the list is soon exhausted of those where anything definite is known,—Franklin's illegitimate son born during the days of his revolt against Puritanism, of which he later speaks with regret; Hamilton's affair with Mrs. Reynolds and Poe's unhappy connections. Over against these few cases can be placed the names of dozens of men and

women of unquestioned integrity and purity,—men like the Adams', father and son, Louis Agassiz, Bancroft, Brooks,—but what need to mention them, for it is practically the entire list.

Attitude Towards Prayer.

In regard to the attitude of these Americans towards prayer, the data are surprisingly complete. Most biographers sum up the character and achievements of the subject of whom they write, and even if the attitude toward prayer has not been prominent throughout, some reference is usually to be found in the final chapter. This criterion of prayer is perhaps more indicative of the real religious attitude than any other. It is interesting that the percent of positive reactions is here exceptionally high.

Habitual Prayer Life.

A total of 43 of the list have been classed as distinctly and habitually men or women of prayer. In all of these cases the attitude seems to be an intelligent one, of communion, guidance and inspiration, and not one in which physical prodigies of the crasser sort are requested. In this group are to be found all the ministers, all the educators, all the jurists, and probably all of the presidents on the list. Reference has been made already to J. Q. Adams' habit of daily devotions. There are like references, in addition to the ministers, to daily devotions on the part of Franklin, Agassiz, Mary Lyon, the two Willards and some others. An interesting example is the following prayer of Bryant and his fiancée, Fanny Fairchild.

"May Almighty God take care of our happiness here and hereafter. May we ever continue constant to each other, and mindful of our mutual promises of attachment and truth. In due time, if it be the will of Providence, may we become more nearly connected with each other, and together may we lead a long, happy and innocent life, without any diminution of affection till we die. May there never be any jealousy, distrust, coldness, or dissatisfaction between us,—nor any occasion for

any noting but kindness, forbearance, mutual confidence, and attention to each other's happiness. And that we may be less unworthy of so great a thing, may we be assisted to cultivate all the benign and charitable affections and offices not only toward each other, but toward our neighbors, the human race, and all the creatures of God. And in all things wherein we have done ill, may we properly repent our error, and may God forgive us and dispose us to do better. When at last we are called to render back the life we have received, may our deaths be peaceful and may God take us to His bosom. All which may He grant for the sake of the Messiah."¹⁰

Occasional Recourse to Prayer.

There were six cases in which prayer was mentioned, and it was evident that the subject did sometimes pray, but the evidence was not sufficient to class him or her as habitually prayerful. The classification of course depends on the use of terms. Among these six are Maria Mitchell, the Astronomer, who regularly attended church but was reverently agnostic. She records a conversation with Whittier in which she said that immortality was the only boon she craved; another with a returned missionary (p. 239) that her favorite attitude in prayer was "flat on my back," by which she refers to the position for scanning the heavens through a telescope. Others in this class of moderate practitioners of prayer are Hawthorne and Jefferson, probably Boone and Morton.

Non Believers in Prayer.

The three who are classed as nonbelievers in prayer are Mark Twain, Poe, and Parkman. The classification depends somewhat on one's definition of prayer, and with the rather broad and general connotation of the word today any one of the three might well slip over into the second class. All three were literary men. Otherwise there seems to be little in common between them. They are at complete variance in birth, training and locality, and they show few common traits of disposition and character.

There are twelve concerning whom no information has been secured on this subject,—including the engineer-inventor group,—Eads, Fulton, Howe and Whitney, also Audubon, Motley, Sherman and Morton. This is largely the list concerning which no adequate biographies are available.

Vocational Experience.

A glance at the tables dealing with vocation will show that many of those who eventually attained pre-eminence had no strong bent in the beginning of their careers, while 33 slightly more than 50%, show definite signs of vocational difficulty. Of the 16 who originally prepared for the law, 10 followed their profession, or entered the government and politics in positions which presupposed the law. But Motley and Parkman became historians; Horace Mann, though moderately successful as a lawyer, was distinguished in the field of education and ended as a college president. Andrew Jackson made his reputation as a military leader; Longfellow and Lowell and Bryant gave up the law for literature or poetry. One or two others in the legal profession, notably Judge Kent, continued to find in poetry and the classics their major interest and allurements. Several others, like General Sherman, tried the law unsuccessfully.¹²

There were nine whose major choice seems to have been the Christian ministry, of whom five became distinguished as ministers. Two, John Adams and James Madison, entered the law and became Presidents of the United States.¹³ Bancroft tried preaching but turned to history; Emerson gave up his pulpit for literature and philosophy. Mark Hopkins, in addition to his other vocations, was an ordained Congregational minister.

Of the six who prepared for military or naval careers, four followed the profession for which they prepared,—Farragut, Grant, Lee and Sherman. But no one of them seems to have chosen his career for love of it. Farragut was adopted by Captain Porter who secured a midshipman's warrant for

him at the age of nine, and put him on a ship. Grant went to West Point under his father's compulsion and against his own will. He wanted to teach Mathematics. Lee wished to become an Episcopal clergyman, but the family were in straitened circumstances and education at West Point was free. Of Sherman the case is less clear, but the free education seems to have been a weighty factor.

Fenimore Cooper entered the navy, but soon gave it up; Poe entered West Point but left for disciplinary reasons; both took up literature because of a fundamental liking for it. George Washington seems as a boy and a young man, if one can believe his early biographers, to have been a leader in playing the war game and to have been fascinated by military glory. He did not enter upon a military career by choice, however, and was not chiefly distinguished in that field.

There were six, mainly women, who prepared for teaching; of these three, Mary Lyon, Alice Freeman and Emma Hart Willard, became distinguished in the field of education. Frances Willard gave up teaching for temperance reform; Joseph Henry by a natural progression, having started to teach science, gave up the more immediate teaching for administrative and scientific work with the Smithsonian. Eli Whitney began as a teacher, on graduation from Yale, though he may have had other plans ultimately in view, but he soon found his true vocation in the field of invention.

Of the five who prepared for medicine, only one attained his chief eminence in that field, Dr. Morton.¹⁴ Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, though a distinguished physician and professor of medicine, chiefly attained in the pursuit of literature. The other three became scientists and teachers of science,—Agassiz, Gray and Mark Hopkins. This seems to point to the fact that medicine has been the parent science from which the various branches of science are mainly derived.

Space forbids going through in detail the vocational aberrations of the entire list. A few observations will perhaps suffice. There seems to be a fundamental psychological relation

between graphic art and invention, viz., Morse and Fulton. The scattering groups, who for the most part did not have specialized training or a college education, had more difficulty and tried more vocations before they found their *métier* than did those with a college education. Some, like Charlotte Cushman, who began with a church choir, made a success of the concert stage, and achieved eminence as a Shakesperian actress, progressed by easy stages from small to large achievement.¹⁵ Others like Lincoln and Grant, went from failure to failure, to a comparatively sudden reversal of fortune and a final burst of glory. Lincoln's progress seems to have been due to the continual upthrust of a great soul, following a growing ideal, while Grant was driven on by a negative fear of failure. Some, among them Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, Franklin and Hamilton, seem to have been endowed with either remarkable brilliance of intellect or dynamic personality, or a combination of the two, such that they would have shone in any age or society. Yet even these were considerably pushed forward by attendant circumstances. They were each the right man at the right place. The eminence of numerous others, such as Fulton, Peabody, Eads, Mary Lyon, or Harriet Beecher Stowe, seems to have rested more upon the time, place and circumstance, than upon exceptional intrinsic ability. They do not show signs of cosmic genius.

Children.

The size of the families in which these Americans were brought up has already been considered. It was found that they came generally from large families, and that the eldest child had a slight advantage in achievement. Of the fifty-five who married, seven had no children of their own. In each case there were nieces or nephews and other young people nearly related whom they supported and brought up. Thirty-three had large families, i.e., four or more children. In eleven cases there were two or three children; one case, one child, and three no information available. In the forty-five families

that had children, there were approximately 228 children, or an average of five per family, the largest number being fifteen—the family of Patrick Henry, and the next largest twelve, that of St. Gaudens, the sculptor.

It lies beyond the scope of this paper to make a detailed study of these 228 children, though such a study might be profitable. A few observations, may, however, be justified. No great and special advantage accrues in the American democratic system to the children of the great, beyond a certain advertising of the name, which may well be a disadvantage. They are not bolstered by primogeniture, hereditary nobility, or even by any special popular favor. Whatever success these 228 children of successful leaders have achieved has been achieved on merit by hard work. Without scientific data for measuring, yet after a careful sifting, it appears that their achievements are about the same as the average of the class and kind of people from which they have sprung. One son, John Quincy Adams, is found in the list, (just as one sister, Harriet Beecher Stowe is there found). One son, Mr. Justice Holmes, of the United States Supreme Court, attained real distinction. But Julian Hawthorne, a brilliant son of Nathaniel, got into jail for some unsound financial promotion. Kit Carson was a grandson of Daniel Boone. But Aaron Burr was a grandson of Jonathan Edwards. Mr. Robert T. Lincoln was a man of distinction, but not of outstanding brilliance. Gilbert Stuart's daughter set up as an artist, but showed little talent. The Grants rode for a while on a wave of prosperity but got into financial troubled waters, along with their father.¹⁶ It is a fair conclusion, therefore, that the second generation run about the average quality of the class or group from which their parents came, with a slight debit balance, due to their more comfortable circumstances, hence less sustained effort and more relaxed self-discipline.

Home Life.

Considering now the homes of the forty-five who married and are known to have had children, in four cases the parents were very indulgent; thirty-one cases devoted,—rather ideal homes it would seem,—four kind but undemonstrative, one very strict, and five no information. Patrick Henry was a devoted father. There is a delightful description of him with his children, lying on his back on the floor or playing his fiddle while they romped around and on top of him.¹⁷ Most of the life of Hawthorne seems rather somber, but real light breaks upon him when he is seen playing about with his children. Mrs. Lincoln had a tendency towards strictness with Tad and Robert, to keep their noses wiped and their hair brushed. But their father was very indulgent, and often quietly circumvented discipline. Audubon tramped through the wilds of the trackless West for months at a time with his elder son, while the younger stayed with the mother, who supported the expedition by teaching. The general impression is that these eminent men were over busied about many things, that they were rather indulgent at occasional leisure times, and left most of the wear and tear of child-training to their wives.

Of the 55 homes, the married life of 46 is pictured as happy. This does not take special account of the 13 second marriages, which were generally peaceful. Four were neutral,—no great happiness and yet comparative peace, as for example the Franklins. Two were distinctly unhappy. Poe is an illustration. At times he showed the greatest tenderness toward his girl wife,—who was like a delicate flower,—but he was moody, was in continual financial difficulty, drank over much, and paid marked attention to other women. In the vast majority of cases there was real love and affection, with mutual helpfulness and forbearance, backed by well balanced character.

The quality of the married life of the 55 who married averages approximately the same as that of the 55 homes from which they came. Eighty-four percent of those who

married are described as happily married, while eighty-five percent of the parents were devoted or deeply devoted. In the parental list and in the list of the next generation there is one divorce each, in both cases a woman who is held morally blameless, but unfortunate. The total average of the marriage relationship is extremely high.

¹ The religious conservatism and moral austerity of John Quincy Adams may have been in part temperamental; it seems also in large part to have been due to the influence of his mother and his mother's family. Abigail Adams, the mother of John Quincy Adams, was the daughter of the Reverend William Smith and Elizabeth (Quincy) Smith, of the nearby town of Weymouth. Abigail brought a devotional spirit into the home of John Adams, which tempered its contentious theological atmosphere. See Morse, John T., Jr., *John Adams*, p. 19ff. Ditto, *John Quincy Adams*, p. 207ff.

² Chadwick, John W., *William Ellery Channing*, p. 169. As a boy Channing loved his cousin and school-mate, Ruth Gibbs. He long hesitated to declare his love. Sherman early fell in love with Ellen Ewing, the pretty daughter of his foster parents, whom he married in Washington in 1850.

³ Lossing, Benson J., *George Washington*, vol. I., p. 50; p. 287.

⁴ Palmer, George H., *Alice Freeman Palmer*, p. 34-41.

⁵ Willard, Frances E., *Glimpses of Fifty Years*, p. 645, "Of the real romance of my life, unguessed save by a trio of close friends, these pages may not tell."

⁶ Easton, Emily, *Roger Williams*, p. 119ff.

⁷ Lord, John, *The Life of Emma Willard*, chap. XI.

⁸ Sumner, William G., *Andrew Jackson*, p. 8-9, where a circumstantial and probably accurate account of this strange affair is given.

⁹ Morse, John T., Jr., *John Quincy Adams*, p. 208.

¹⁰ Quoted by Bradley, William A., *William Cullen Bryant*, Bryant at that time wrote to his intended one of his finest poems, "O Fairest of the Rural Maids."

¹¹ Kendall, K. M., *Maria Mitchell*, p. 250; p. 239.

¹² Sherman, William T., *Memoirs*, vol. I., p. 141.

¹³ Morse, John T., Jr., *John Adams*, p. 10. The biographer makes it plain that John Adams intended to enter the Christian Ministry. One wonders by what criteria he judged that Adams was "much too big for the ministry."

¹⁴ No good biography of Dr. William T. G. Morton has been written. From available sources it would seem that Morton's ideas grew with his opportunities. He considered himself fortunate in being able to secure sufficient education to practise dentistry. He used that as a stepping stone to the larger opportunities in the field of medicine.

¹⁵ Perhaps the stages of progression were not so easy; for it was usually failure or adversity that pressed the career onward and upward. In Charlotte Cushman's case it was the failure of her voice as a concert singer which brought out her character and showed her dramatic talent. Stebbins, Emma, *Charlotte Cushman*, p. 22.

¹⁶ King, General Charles, *The True Ulysses S. Grant*, p. 381ff.

¹⁷ Wirt, William, *Patrick Henry*, p. 296.

CHAPTER X.

MOTIVES, IDEALS AND PURPOSES

Motives of Famous Americans

<i>Major Interest as described, that Led to Achievement</i>		<i>Previous Failures</i>	
Patriotism or Liberty	11	None	50
God and Humanity	11	One	6
Scholarship and Literature	9	Two or more	7
			—
			63
People	7	<i>Other Considerable</i>	
Nature	6	<i>Achievements</i>	
Adventure	3	None	44
Music and Art	3	One	12
Mechanics	4	Two	3
Military Service and		More than two	4
Discipline	3		—
Politics	2		63
Embodiment of Ideals	2	<i>Apparent Secondary</i>	
Everything	1	<i>Motives</i>	
Question	1	Ambition	4
	—	Success	6
	63	Service	18

<i>Apparent Dominant Motive</i>		Self Expression	9
Love to God and		Love of Nature	2
Humanity	20	Patriotism	9
Humanity	5	Culture	1
To make God all in all	1	Truth	3
Bring Kingdom of God	1	Welfare of Woman	4
Love of Nature as God's		Liberty	4
Handiwork	2	Fill world with spirit of	
Duty	5	God	2
Will of God	2	Amusement	1
Self Expression	8		—
Success	6		63
Adventure	1		
Justice	1		
Patriotism	6		
Express Goodness, Truth			
and Beauty	2		
Love of Truth	2		
Love of Beauty	1		
	—		
	63		

Motives, Ideals and Purposes

Motivation.

A study into significant factors in the youth of famous Americans would be distinctly limited and incomplete did it not contain some consideration of the subject of motivation. A motive is here defined as an incentive or prime mover to action. If education and character training are to be effective in working towards an objective or planned result, there must be an understanding on the part of the educator of the principles of motivation and some skill in the art of influencing motives toward the end in view. We assume that the child is equipped with certain urges, such as the desire for food or for activity, which while unappeased bring hunger or restlessness. The successful meeting of the urge brings satisfaction; and a series of urges satisfied, taken together in operation, may be called a motive. We assume secondly that, since the child first knows himself as an individual, and feels his own satisfactions, primary motivation is organized in reference to the self. And thirdly, since life is made up to so great a degree of experiences of people and things exterior to the self, and since the growing child learns increasingly to identify his satisfactions with the control of these exterior relationships, we assume that motivation is related to and changes with the process of socialization, i.e., that the urges which direct action in the individual may be so organized as to take an increasingly accurate and correct account of objects, facts, and interests exterior to himself. In other words, in the degree that an individual is socialized, in that degree he identifies himself with the environment in which he shares. If these assumptions are sound, they will apply to motivation in the lives of the individuals whom we are studying.

Difficulty of Dealing with Motives.

In dealing with names, places, and dates of birth, we deal with objective facts which can be stated and compared in the same manner as scientific data. We have seen that there are facts of religious education and adult personal life, which are less objective, but which can be handled with some degree of satisfaction. Motives and their kindred ideals and purposes which enter into the formation of character and which constitute the field of purposive psychology, are elusive. Their boundaries are tenuous and difficult to define. If they are to be classified and measured at all, the secondary evidence by which they give an account of themselves must be based upon definite criteria which will give a comparable standard of reference. The majority of writers who have entered this field have felt the difficulty and many have expressed their dissatisfaction with the results obtained.

Purposive Psychology.

Troth in his recent *Selected Readings in Character Education*, sums up the situation by saying, "It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that there is no other field concerning which more scientific knowledge is wanted, and less is available."¹ Emerson, writing almost a century ago, treats the subject mystically, as effected without means and therefore beyond the powers of analysis. He says in his *Essay on Character*, "This is that which we call character,—a reserved force which acts directly by prescience and without means. It is conceived of as a certain undemonstrable force, a Familiar or Genius, by whose impulse the man is guided, but whose counsels he cannot impart."² Pierce, referring to Emerson, and writing much more recently, holds that little real progress has been made in this field since the days of Emerson. "We have not shown in detail," he says, "how fine character, or any character, is developed. Such, I conceive, is the task of the purposive psychology of the future, a task only just begun. . . . At

present, all that has been accomplished, if indeed anything has, is to furnish some intelligible basis, on which such a psychology may be reared."³ The present writer would hold that much has been accomplished since Emerson wrote, most of the really important results having appeared, however, in the decade since this statement was made by Pierce. Harts-horne and May give a bibliography of one hundred ninety-six titles in the field of personality and character measurement which appeared within the five years previous to 1926.⁴

The Study of Characteristics.

Most of the tests as listed in the above-mentioned bibliography have to do with some particular phase of conduct or element of behavior, such as the measurement of trustworthiness, the test of deception, and the analysis of will-temperament group tests. This is the scientific method, and by these advances on particular sectors the field of the unknown in character motivation is gradually lessened. But as Roback suggests in his *Psychology of Character*, many of the so-called character tests really test characteristics rather than character. Some of the tests, as well as the majority of the books in the field, address themselves to the larger aspects of the problem; but none of them, so far as the writer is aware, have attempted a comparative study of biography as a source of laboratory material for character education.⁵

The Study of Personality as a Whole.

The biographical approach to the study of character and motivation is ably outlined by the Right Honorable Jan C. Smuts in his *Holism and Evolution*, to which reference has been made in the introduction. General Smuts says, "From a series of biographical studies such as I propose, it will, I imagine, become clear that personalities follow their own laws of inner growth and development, which will, while confirming to a general plan, show very considerable diversity in detail. It will be found that each Personality is a psychic biological

organism, an individual personal whole, with its own curve of development, but all the stages and phases will be bound together by and be the outcome of the identical inner Personality. A comparison of such studies of individual Personalities will then give the curve or the law of Personality, and reduce to rational order a phenomenon which is today within the region of mystery. As the key to all the highest interests of the human race, Personality seems to be quite the most important and fruitful problem to which the thinkers of the coming generation could direct their attention. . . . Not without reason have thinkers throughout the ages shied off from it. But it holds precious secrets for those who will seriously devote themselves to the new science or discipline of Personology."⁶

The distinguished author of *Holism* is unquestionably right when he speaks of the difficulty of a clear understanding and correct solution of the problems of personality and character development. This is particularly true in the field of motivation and purposive psychology. It would be more accurate to say, however, that, instead of shying off from these problems, the scholars and teachers of the past, having solved certain of them, were baffled in making further progress on account of the lack of scientific methods and technical tools, some of which are now available. Certainly the ancients from the time of Confucius, Gautama Buddha, Plato, and Jesus of Nazareth had made much progress in the understanding of personality, and have given us valuable material in the field of character education.

Recent Progress in the Study of Character.

The great progress recently evidenced in the field of character motivation has been made through the application of fresh combinations of psychology and philosophy to experimental material in education, and even more recently the addition by a few investigators of the values and forces of religion. There are many theories of character, varying accord-

ing to the presuppositions and methods of the investigator; and these very differences are in part responsible for the richness of recent results. Among the more important theories of character now being applied is first what we may call Professor John Dewey's "Interpenetration of habits," as described in his *Human Nature and Conduct*.⁷ Another is A. F. Shand's formulation of "emotional patterns" to be found in *Foundations of Character*. Still another valuable approach is Spearman and Webb's "factor theories" of the persistence of motives. Of particular interest is Jung's use of the forces of religion in the formation of character though his application of these forces is more directly to the clearing of impediments in the functioning of adult character and to the solution of inner conflicting motives than to the original development from childhood of harmonious character.⁸

An excellent review of these many different character theories is to be found in Hartshorne's *Character in Human Relations*.⁹ On the basis of this review he says, "A backward glance through the theories so far elucidated will reveal a trend toward some sort of dynamic or organic functioning as constituting the fact of character. Specific responses are either constitutionally organized or somehow get organized into traits, groups of traits, or general factors. Integration, in other words, is as much a fact of behavior as the specific act."¹⁰ He then proceeds to show, in referring to the points of view of Dr. Coe and Dr. Kilpatrick, that character is integrated about the self in relation to its environment. He says, "Integration of the inner mechanism and forces of an individual is relative to the opportunities and changes of the environment in which it lives."¹¹

A major question of character development seems to be how the traits and factors become organized in relation to the self. While there are many other lines of enquiry which we would like to follow, in the study of character growth, this question of the organization of experience around the ego seems to be paramount. It is the question *par excellence* of

motivation, and it is the one particularly to which we wish to give attention.

As has been suggested, character development seems to run parallel to and to be relative to the experiences of the individual in the enlargement of his environment. One variable in the enlarging experience which we call education is the attitude of the individual toward the environment into which his experience takes him. This attitude varies in the degree that he considers himself separate from and opposed to his environment, or enters into his environment as an extension of his enlarged self. In other words, how far does the individual seek to dominate that which is external to himself, and thus organize all experience around his ego centric, selfish self, or, on the other hand, how far does he identify himself with the universe of his experience and enter into the onward drive of events as an interested shareholder in the collective outcome? What we wish to measure, therefore, in the study of character motivation is the degree to which the ego centric individual has become socialized.

The Measurable in Motivation.

One of the major difficulties which has retarded the study of purposive psychology is the fact that motives as such are not directly measurable. Many people purposely conceal their motives, while even the most sincere are incapable of accurately judging and expressing their own motivation. Yet an outsider can form some judgment of a man's motives by a study of what he does. The objectively observable is the result of the motor forces operating in the behavior of the individual. Long ago Confucius expressed this idea with cryptic terseness. "The Master said, 'See what a man does. Mark his motives. Examine in what he rests, (i.e. how he spends his leisure, when off his guard.) How can a man conceal his character? How *can* a man conceal his character?' "12

Behavior and Biography.

We assume that the character motivation of an individual, at least in so far as it refers to the degree to which an ego-centric individual has become socialized, can be understood by an examination of what he has done,—by a study of his behavior as revealed in his biography. The estimates of character motivation as found in the typical biography have proven singularly unrewarding. The material which resulted from a search of biographies and autobiographies in pursuance of these studies, and which is to be found in the chart at the beginning of this chapter has resisted all attempts at collation and scientific analysis. The writer has therefore gone back to a fresh study of the deeds and actions of the subjects as related in the biographies, to see whether he can discover any other method of rating their motivation, "for by their fruits shall ye know them."

Criteria for Rating Behavior.

In answer to the question, What categories can be applied in the systematic study of motivation,—one can apply the pragmatic test of usefulness,—How does it work? How far does a certain type of behavior bring larger life to the individual and to the society of which he is a part? An extended study of the writing and reported teaching of the world's great philosophers, moralists, and religious teachers, too long to reproduce here, from Confucius, Plato, and Jesus of Nazareth down to our own times, brings out as the common object of their search *the ideal individual in the ideal society*. Some have laid more emphasis on the individual and some on society, but *the process of character education is the socialization of the ego-centric individual. Socialized individuals create a better society. A better society is measured by the abundance of life of the individuals that comprise it.* The relation is reciprocal. In the better society the individuals develop in turn the more abundant life. This abundant life is individual and it is social. It is physical,

moral, and intellectual. It is above all spiritual. The spiritual condition of a people is the atmosphere,—the climate which determines the growth of the moral, i.e. of the truly socialized, life. In terms of motivation the object of religious and character education is to discover, stimulate, and develop by use those springs of action which will result in socialized behavior, measured from the individual with an ever-widening radius. It is of course understood that motivation is voluntary, and that external compulsion is the opposite of true motivation. *That which is measurable in motivation is, then, the degree of voluntary socialization of the individual which results in more or less socialized behavior.*

A simple scale of rating has been devised, as nearly as possible on a par with those criteria which were set up in the other sections of this study.¹³ Beginning with the individual and reaching out through the more intimate relationships of the family and society to the most distant races of men; starting with the more objective and material relationships and extending to the subjective and spiritual concepts of the individual, ten categories have been chosen for rating behavior as it reveals the socialization of the individual. Four of these categories are in the home, three in the community, and three at large. In any one of the ten an individual shall be rated as little socialized, $1/3$; moderately socialized, $2/3$; highly socialized, 1. The percentages assigned represent the writer's conclusions on the basis of his studies of the biographies. While they have no authority, further than that of his own conclusions, they are useful as a summary of the study, and as a basis for the discussion which follows.

The Categories Chosen for Rating.

The most intimate relationship in the lives of the majority of people is that between husband and wife; it is also the most objective. It is generally regarded as fundamental to the social structure. It is therefore chosen as the first of the cate-

gories for measurement. The second, for like reasons, is the relationship between parent and child. The next two are divided because they show the character of the individual in quite different lights,—the relationship with relatives and friends, and that with servants and dependents. These four comprise the categories of relationships within the home, and its immediate entourage. The next three cover the field of the community. That of business,—the making and spending of money, often brings out a conflict between the interests of the family and that of the community, and reveals most clearly whether a man has transferred the implications of his intimate family experience to the larger circle. In addition to rating a man's business practises, it seemed desirable to secure data also on the service which he personally rendered to his community, and the type and amount of "philanthropy" for which he was ready to spend his money. If we were to confine ourselves to a scale of ten, this left us three places for the three major and distinct categories,—national outlook, race outlook, and religious outlook, or "Weltanschauung." The individuals rated were adults, whole individuals, taken as organisms, reacting toward situations, as illustrative of the Holistic point of view. It was moreover, in actual practise, found that most individuals after attaining maturity reacted consistently in respect to the categories laid down, so that a character-pattern of their behavior could be drawn up.

Socialization Rated.

The individuals rated were, of course, of a very high order. In many ways they represent the best that America has produced. This accounts for the high ratings recorded, the highest category being their treatment of children, 99%, and the next highest, marital relations, 95.6%. This does not necessarily mean that their treatment of spouse or children was the wisest or the most intelligent according to our present-day standards; it means rather that their motives were high in the sense of being socialized and unselfish. As was perhaps

TABLE OF SOCIALIZATION

NAME	WIFE, HUSBAND	CHILD, OWN OR ADOPTED	RELATIVES AND FRIENDS	SERVANTS AND DEPENDENTS	BUSINESS: MAKE AND SPEND	COMMUNITY SERVICE	PHILANTHROPY	NATIONAL OUTLOOK	RACE OUTLOOK	RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK	TOTAL
1. Adams, J.	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
2. Adams, J. Q.	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	9
3. Agassiz	I	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	I	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
4. Audubon	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	6 $\frac{2}{3}$
5. Bancroft	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I		I	8 $\frac{2}{3}$
6. Beecher	I	I	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
7. Boone	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	5 $\frac{2}{3}$
8. Brooks		I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	9
9. Bryant	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	I	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
10. Channing	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	I	I	I	9 $\frac{2}{3}$
11. Choate	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	8 $\frac{2}{3}$
12. Clay	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	6 $\frac{2}{3}$
13. Clemens	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7 $\frac{2}{3}$
14. Cooper, J. F.	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
15. Cooper, P.	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
16. Cushman		I	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	8
17. Eads	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
18. Edwards	I	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{1}{3}$	8 $\frac{2}{3}$
19. Emerson	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	I	I	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
20. Farragut	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7 $\frac{2}{3}$
21. Franklin	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
22. Fulton	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
23. Grant	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
24. Gray	I		I	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	8
25. Hamilton	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	8
26. Hawthorne	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	8
27. Henry, J.											
28. Henry, P.	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	8 $\frac{2}{3}$
29. Holmes	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	8 $\frac{2}{3}$
30. Hopkins	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
31. Howe											
32. Irving	I	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	I	$\frac{2}{3}$	I	9

TABLE OF SOCIALIZATION

NAME	WIFE, HUSBAND	CHILD, OWN OR ADOPTED	RELATIVES AND FRIENDS	SERVANTS AND DEPENDENTS	BUSINESS: MAKE AND SPEND	COMMUNITY SERVICE	PHILANTHROPY	NATIONAL OUTLOOK	RACE OUTLOOK	RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK	TOTAL
33. Jackson	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7 $\frac{1}{3}$
34. Jefferson	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	8 $\frac{1}{3}$
35. Kent	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	8 $\frac{2}{3}$
36. Lee	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	8
37. Lincoln	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	1	1	9 $\frac{1}{3}$
38. Longfellow	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	9
39. Lowell	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	1	9
40. Lyon		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	$\frac{1}{3}$	8 $\frac{1}{3}$
41. Madison	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	8 $\frac{1}{3}$
42. Mann	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	9 $\frac{1}{3}$
43. Marshall	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	9
44. Morse	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	8
45. Morton	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	8 $\frac{1}{3}$
46. Mitchell		1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	8
47. Motley	1	1	1	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7
48. Palmer	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	9 $\frac{1}{3}$
49. Parkman	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7 $\frac{2}{3}$
50. Peabody		1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	1	1	8 $\frac{1}{3}$
51. Poe	$\frac{1}{3}$		$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	3 $\frac{1}{3}$
52. St. Gaudens	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7
53. Story	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	9
54. Sherman	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7
55. Stowe	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	9
56. Stuart	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7
57. Washington	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	9 $\frac{1}{3}$
58. Webster	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	7 $\frac{1}{3}$
59. Whittier		1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	8 $\frac{1}{3}$
60. Whitney	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	8 $\frac{1}{3}$
61. Willard, E.	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	9
62. Willard, F.		1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	1	1	1	8 $\frac{2}{3}$
63. Williams	1	1	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	$\frac{2}{3}$	1	1	9 $\frac{1}{3}$
Percent	95.6	99	95	80	71	76	80	78	77	82	

to be expected, there is a general drift of the ratings downward as we get away from the individual toward the more distant or more tenuous relationships of society. The lowest rating of all the categories is in the field of business—the making and spending of money, 71%, according to which it would seem that the economic morality of the American people has lagged behind the development of morality in other fields.

Turning now to individual scores, the highest rating given was to Channing, 96%, and the lowest to Poe, 33%. With the exception of Poe, the poets, the preachers, and the women ranked highest, while artists, inventors, and military men tended to be marked down. The average for the whole group was 82%. If generalizations may be hazarded on such limited grounds, the poets, preachers, and women here studied were for the most part highly educated in the humanities, and were engaged in socialized, humanitarian pursuits. The artists of the period had very limited general education and seemed rather oblivious to social relationships. The inventors were of the artistic temperament; their inventions brought them without training and late in life into the field of business, for which they were not fitted, and in which their characters did not always show up in the best light. The military men carried the attitude of force and external discipline, engendered in military service, into the other relationships of life, where they are in direct opposition to the principle of socialization, which is by nature voluntary.

The Family as a Social Unit.

One of the most outstanding features of the entire study is the strong position of the family as a social unit. Considerable stress has already been laid upon the mutual devotion of the parents of these Americans to each other and to their children. Here again in the second generation almost ideal marital conditions are found in the cases of the subjects studied, and the devotion of these parents to their children or adopted children is marked in the extreme. In only six cases

was any marital unhappiness, even slight, indicated, while in all but two there was harmony and deep devotion in the relationship with children. In 52 of the 63 cases scored this high degree of socialization was extended to the immediate family and to a circle of close friends. Get the picture of Patrick Henry playing the violin for the singing of hymns at family worship, or lying on the floor with his grandchildren romping over him; of Washington Irving with his nieces and nephews gathered about him; of Alice Freeman as portrayed by her devoted husband, or of Louis Agassiz and Asa Gray as depicted by their wives, and you will see one of the strongest features of American life, a feature which is common to the large majority of the lives studied. And in so far as the facts are available, we find that the sons and daughters, nieces and nephews, brought up under these excellent conditions of family life in the homes of the famous Americans on our list, turned out to be desirable, useful citizens who exhibited a high degree of socialization. We conclude, therefore, that the extension of the socializing process from the ego-centered individual to a feeling of responsibility for the abundant life for the family is possible, and that it brings highly desirable results in the lives of those affected. We find a distinct barrier at the outer limit of the family circle, which limits those who are intimate within it. A major problem which remains for those concerned in religious and character education is the extension of the social principles operative within the family to the wider reaches of society.

Attention has already been called, in several places, including Chapter IV,—Dominant Influences on Famous Americans—to the remarkable degree of devotion of the subjects studied to their parents, particularly to their mothers, and to the mutual bond of sympathy between mother and child. It is there stated that in fifty-two of the sixty-three cases one or both parents played a leading part in the career of the son or daughter, leaving but few for the orphan and the unknown. There is a close correlation between the fifty-three cases in

one generation where the parents were very close to the child, and the fifty-two cases in the next generation where the whole family was highly socialized. The relationship with the mother is the beginning of the socializing process. If it is successfully carried through, the subject may be considered as well on his way towards social equilibrium. In the cases where there was a notable clash between either of the parents and the child, for example Hamilton, Franklin, and Grant, this maladjustment seems to have left a permanent scar on the life, and the individual generally had difficulty in the primary social adjustments later in life.

The Individual and the Community.

The scores are distinctly lower when we pass beyond that boundary which surrounds the family. Servants and dependents, though found within the home, are not generally considered as of it. The making and spending of money brings out an apparent conflict of interest between the welfare of the home and the conditions of society in general. The individual does not usually apply the same criteria of right and wrong to his treatment of the public that he applies in his family relationships. His love of his family is usually real, and is supplemented by pride and self-love; while his love of the public is limited and largely theoretical. The injunction, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is an ancient one, which is still far from realization. To a large degree in the religious education and the cultural backgrounds of the lives studied, the absolute values of this social principle were not accepted. Room was made both within the church and in popular morality for slavery, indentured servitude, imprisonment for debt, as well as civil and international warfare. As has been noted elsewhere, the people honored by membership in the Hall of Fame list are to a large degree responsible for extending the principles of social conduct current within the family, in so far as they have been extended, to the wider areas of the community and society in general. This is particularly

true in the fields of religious and political liberty, (Roger Williams; Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Hamilton), popular education, (Horace Mann, Mark Hopkins), chattel slavery, (Lincoln, Whittier, Stowe, Grant), and the status of womanhood, (the two Willards, Mary Lyon, and Alice Freeman), to mention but a few of the outstanding examples. This is in agreement with the high scores made on our table of socialization, and shows by their conduct that they were highly socialized, in some at least of the areas of human relationships. That this extension of socialization was in part a natural outgrowth of satisfying social relationships within the family seems to be clear. How far it was due to an ideal inspired by their religious concepts and crystallized into a purpose would be difficult to establish. It is true that in the cases studied religious idealism and socializing activity were generally found together in the same individual. In some cases the social implication of their religious philosophy was itself faulty.

Social Progress in Nationalism, and Race Relations.

Life in the American colonies and the earlier years of the United States was distinctly provincial. By the masses of the population, strangers, people from a distance, foreigners, and people of other races were little thought of, whether red, white, or black. The socializing process had not leavened human relationships to any great degree outside the family and the village. Negroes were bought and sold like cattle. The scalp of a red Indian was of less intrinsic worth, but as highly prized, as the skin of a beaver. Frenchmen and Spaniards were obstacles to expansion and competitors in trading whiskey and beads to the natives. To the citizens of one colony even the citizens of the other colonies were more or less foreigners. There were three centers of culture, in Boston, New York, and the Virginia-Carolina region in which these narrow limits were transcended, and from which socializing influences radiated. In the central and southern centers the culture and education were limited to a narrow range of the

population; while in New England it was somewhat more widely distributed. In these centers we find the leaders of the socializing process, leaders in literature, education, science, art, government, and religion, the names of many of whom are among the lives we have been studying. By this study, therefore, we see the socializing process in action. The process of socialization tended to break down on the frontier but as the frontier moved Westward, the cultural influences were never far behind. Daniel Boone, for example, came of Quaker hence pacifist and moderately educated stock. Yet he could scarcely read and write; his social horizons were very limited, and red Indians were outside the pale of his moral sentiments, like wild animals to be deceived, robbed, or shot.¹⁴ Roger Williams and Jonathan Edwards, on the other hand, applied to the Indians the principles of the Golden Rule. To Andrew Jackson, despite his religious upbringing, Negroes existed to wait on white men and till their fields. Whittier and Harriet Beecher Stowe were among the leaders in the abolition of human slavery. Others of the group, among them Jefferson, Henry, and Madison, though themselves large owners of slaves, believed in and threw their weight on the side of, the abolition of slavery,—at least at some future date.

Religious Socialization.

The question of how far these people were socialized religiously is an interesting one. The criteria are more open to misconstruction and inaccuracy in application than in most of the other fields studied; but it seemed worth while to attempt a rating. The rating has been made upon the answer to the question, How far did the religious philosophy of the individual promote and how far did it limit his activity in the furtherance of the socializing process? Was his religion centered upon a selfish, other-worldly salvation, or was it a Gospel of the love of God for all his children? It seems clear enough that the religion of Harriet Beecher Stowe included the Negro, and was a major motivating force in her activity

for the liberation and evangelization of the slaves. With the liberation of Horace Mann from a narrower form of Calvinism to a Universalist point of view theologically came the devotion of his life to the cause of universal, popular education. The enthusiasm and success of Alice Freeman in the higher education of women can hardly be dissociated from her contagious religion, which centered in a Gospel of Love. In such cases religion was clearly a socializing force. On the other hand, the religion of Jonathan Edwards, with its strong flavor of brimstone, is rated as a-social. In a desperate attempt to secure an academic "justice" of God, Edwards made the deity out to be exceedingly unjust, and by the limitations which he put upon salvation, he limited the free outworking of the social process.¹⁵ Jonathan Edwards played strongly upon the negative or fear motive in religious evangelism, a motive which had crept into Christianity in its too rapid expansion in the Roman Empire and which was still generally current throughout Christendom. Edwards inherited this negative religious philosophy, which so limited the progress of socialization; and he pushed it to its logical conclusions, thereby proving to others, not himself, its unworth. He is rated down to $1/3$ in his socio-religious outlook, because of the un-social implications of his "plan of salvation," though unwittingly he promoted the revolt against the doctrines which he proclaimed. On the other hand, we must not rate him too low; for we are rating these individuals primarily on the basis of what they did, and in actual practise he lived much better than his tenets would warrant. He did not attempt to put into practise in his justice toward and punishment of his children, or in his relations with the American Indians, to whom he was for a time a missionary, the distorted ideas of divine justice and eternal punishment which he preached.¹⁶ His total scale of socialization judged by his acts and his relationships with his fellow men is very high, here rated 86%. Except for his theology, he should have rated 93%. Yet few of the subjects have been thus rated down on account

of their religious beliefs; as the majority of them were outstandingly social for their times both in theory and in practise. The low marks come in the fields of slavery, war, class distinctions, and business relationships, to which the moral and religious teachers were, during the period under review, just beginning to give their attention.

Carryover and Progress in Socialization.

That the ideas of the moral and religious teachers have had a distinct carryover in the life and institutions of the people appears in following certain moral issues as mirrored in the lives of these leaders through several generations. There is a strong tendency towards liberalization of ideas throughout the period, together with a liberating of capacities for living. John Quincy Adams is the only example among the sixty-three of retrogression toward more conservative ideas than those held by his parents, and in some respects, notably in his strong advocacy of the abolition of slavery, he was an outstanding liberal. In fact the pattern for the development of a leader in any major social advance throughout the entire period is that of strongly conservative social, economic, and religious environment in childhood, which seems to provide the initial character education, in the process of the release of the conservative pressure by liberalizing education and experience. Once a liberal movement spends its energy, which had been pent up by a previous conservative tendency, it loses its force. The writer ventures the opinion, based upon the facts observed and just stated that, as prosperity is supposed to come with credit expansion and consequent price rise, so advances of socialization come during periods of liberalization; and that these liberal periods must be followed by periods of conservatism, during which what is commonly called "Puritanism" makes strong advances. A large number of the effective lives which we have studied came out of the liberalizing of the conservative New England tradition. Several other well-marked conservative tides have been felt in this

country, notably the mid-Victorian, during the resolution of which important leaders of social movements were produced.

We get a perspective on the socializing process by following a particular moral issue in the lives of the people here studied through a period of several generations. The attainments of progress are often dramatized in the lives of individuals who forced the speeding up of social activity. Roger Williams, for example, fought the battle of religious liberty, with suffering and temporary defeat for himself. But the progress attained under his leadership probably helped to bring the larger liberty enjoyed by Jefferson and Madison. They in turn were the chief promoters of the separation of church and state. This separation facilitated the liberal movement in religion under Channing, Emerson, and Beecher, as well as the liberalization of popular education under Mark Hopkins and Horace Mann. Women's education likewise profited, and the impetus given by Emma Willard was carried further by Mary Lyon and Alice Freeman Palmer.

Human Effort in the Direction of History.

Mechanical inventions also have both facilitated other inventions to follow, and have had a deep and lasting effect upon the social fabric. A startling instance is that of the invention of the cotton gin by Eli Whitney, which so increased the growing of cotton, hence the extent and horrors of slavery, that the crisis which led to the civil war was precipitated.¹⁷ The careers of a dozen of the subjects of this study were concerned in that crisis, and at least five of them were major actors in it. We see immediately that the cause of this historical crisis was partially mechanical. It is not possible to estimate to what extent these individuals were creatures of their times, pushed forward by force of circumstance, and to what extent their own motivation and character qualities created the crises and gave direction to their outcome. There are undoubtedly major factors of liberty of choice opposed by influences of self-interest and environment operating from

opposite directions upon the individual. One of the major objectives of this study is the discovery of the principles and art of increasing the voluntary factor in the direction of history and the use of that increased liberty toward social progress. From the examples given it appears that there must be a field in which human effort is operative in the direction of human history, limited by mechanical inventions and social and political institutions. There is no way at present to measure the angle through which the individual or a group of individuals can deflect the course of history, or the force which they can bring to bear upon it. The net result of this study has been to increase rather than to diminish in the mind of the writer his estimate of the value and extent of human liberty of choice, that is to increase his estimate of the freedom of the individual in directing the course of history.

Socialization and the Higher Satisfactions.

Certain assumptions were made in the beginning of this chapter, which we have used in the study of motivation and have found applicable to our biographical material. In the light of that application they may now be stated as follows:

1. The individual child starts out in life ego centrically motivated.

2. He discovers his own needs and judges of the satisfactions of life from his own personal point of view before he discovers the needs and satisfactions of others.

3. Value or progress in motivation can be rated in the direction and to the extent of the movement of the individual's motivation from ego centric toward the discovery of the needs and appreciation of the satisfactions of others, which is called socialization.

In this socializing process the individual increasingly finds his satisfactions in the satisfactions of others. This when emotionalized is one of the chief aspects of love. Certain philosophers and moral teachers have called this process "enlightened selfishness." Others are dissatisfied with that

characterization, in that the process is, in their judgment, in its salient features in the opposite direction, away from, selfishness. The essential feature is that the emotion or the satisfaction must be real. Illustrations of the socializing process in action may be selected from the lives of almost any one of those studied. We find it described in detail in the case of Benjamin Franklin,—headstrong, and self-opinionated, breaking away from the parental roof and quarreling with his brothers, begetting an unwanted son and misusing a trust fund, struggling with himself, worshipping, and daily examining himself, until he became one of the world's most honored and cultured citizens, with wide sympathies, effectively devoted to the welfare of others in city, state, and nation, and even beyond the seas. No one can have a reasonable doubt that this was in the life of Franklin a socializing process which led to the deepest satisfactions which he experienced. John Adams is interesting, in that, well educated and highly socialized though he became, his career was marred by a petty egotism and a pompous pride which he could never fully conceal or overcome. It is the glory of George Washington that he was so far socialized, that, although his economic and social interests lay on the side of the British government, he yet risked being branded as a revolutionary traitor, for the sake of his people, and when the victory had been won, he refused a crown in order that a new type of social structure might be set up. Egotism has been the motivation of the pomp and glory of monarchy. The socialization process is democratic. It has no place for pomp and glory, and ultimately must eliminate monarchy and autocracy.

Socialization Based upon Self-Discipline.

From the lives here studied it is evident that socialization tends to reward the individual with more and higher satisfactions than does the immediate and uncontrolled reaction of conflicting desires. The emphasis is therefore upon self-control as a prerequisite to self-expres-

sion rather than directly on self-expression, as a first major objective in education. Over emphasis on the activity side of expression results in discord; whereas self-control brings harmony into the life of the individual and of society. The instincts and emotions of human life are like the keys and stops of a pipe organ. The object of the organist is to produce not uncontrolled noise but harmony. In this regard the most successful characters in our study were those brought up in a *via media* or golden mean of moderate discipline. George Washington has just been cited as one who was highly and successfully socialized. He was also moderately disciplined, until such time as he began to show the qualities of self-discipline which later so characterized his life. Grant is an example of unreasoning discipline, imposed by his father and by military authorities, which produced a warped and unhappy character, who could not control his own appetite for whisky. Severe external discipline often results in undisciplined self-expression as soon as the external control is removed.

An outstanding example of undisciplined self-expression is that of Edgar Poe. A handsome, high-strung boy, who had spent his earliest years in poverty, after his adoption by the Allens of Richmond, Virginia, he was dressed in velvet and stood upon the banquet table by his misguided foster parents with a glass of wine in his hand, to declaim and recite before the admiring guests—certainly undisciplined self-expression. He could not abide the discipline of the University of Virginia or of West Point. He became an inveterate gambler and a hard drinker. His pride and temper were such that he could not hold an editorial position, nor could he support himself and his girl wife. It seems fair to conclude that Poe's brilliant qualities as a poet were limited in their expression of his true self by the uncontrolled reactions of his conflicting impulses. Certainly he denied himself many of the higher satisfactions of life. Poe's unhappy life is attributed by some writers to temperament; doubtless he was of a sensitive and volatile disposition, already predisposed to moodiness. But certainly

his pathological state was greatly aggravated if not produced by the undisciplined self-expression of his childhood.^{18 19}

The Effect of Discipline.

There are many instances in the biographies where a sensitive child like Grant or Channing was subjected to severe discipline or unmerciful teasing, or a man of genius like Patrick Henry or Lincoln was put to selling salt and calico and failed. It would seem that considerable latitude should be given to young people for the discovery and expression of special interests, and that where there is evidence of exceptional ability or genius, they should be largely freed from the treadmill of routine. It is possible that an Audubon or a Lincoln could be put through the routine of present day schools and never get beyond the calico selling stage in their careers. Yet in general the principles which we have enunciated of discipline leading to self control apply as well to average people and to the genius type. The more sensitive and intelligent the child the quicker he will understand the reason which lies beyond the discipline, and the more readily can he be induced to take over that self-discipline which is the fundamental basis of character.

Ideals.

If there is reason for the discipline which is applied in the development of character then there must be some goal or objective which lies ahead. In making a shirt there must be a pattern; in building a ship there is a model. So in the development of character there should be an ideal. Of this character-forming process Thorndike says, "The good and efficient character implies the subjugation of those instinctive tendencies to action which injure oneself or others, the energetic action of desirable ones, *the presence of worthy ideals and the connection of these with worthy acts*, a multiplicity of useful habits, the power to see and react to the element of the situation which will issue in an act producing the best results, the

power to react to barren abstractions, such as ought, right, and true,—the power to delay decision until enough evidence is in to warrant one in deciding, the power to refrain from delaying too long, and the power to stand the strain of effort implied in choosing a relatively unattractive course of action.”²⁰ We have already spoken of the subjugation of instincts by self-discipline, and of the expression of desirable tendencies, to which Professor Thorndike refers. Before further progress can be made the subject of ideals must be treated.

The formation of ideals or an ideal seems to be a universal tendency of normal intelligent human beings. Here lies the sensitive spot of character education and religious training. The little girl imitates her mother in playing with her dolls. The child of the slums chooses the gunman and the gangster as his model. The seven sons of Lyman Beecher all wanted to be preachers like their father. We have laid great stress throughout these studies on the place of the home and the influence of the parents, particularly the mother as significant factors in the education of the child. The significance lies largely in the ideals which the home and the mother impress upon the sensitive mind of the child, and the early habits of life and thought which result. Fortunately these early impressions are strong, for they are often the best that we have; but fortunately also, they are modifiable by the school and by later experience. Thus generation by generation improvement may be made, but fundamentally the home remains the character forming institution.

Types of Ideal.

Thorndike speaks in the quotation above of “the presence of worthy ideals.” The word is used in the plural, and the writer is evidently thinking distributively of certain abstractions connected with conduct desirable of attainment. This point of view represents the analytical mind, with a minimum of emotional affectability. Thomson, in his *Springs of Human*

Action speaks in the singular of the ego-ideal. He says, "It is well nigh hopeless to look for 'the motive' or a 'pure' motive. . . . The best we may hope for in this field is, first of all, to appreciate the complex nature of our motives, urges, drives, and incentives to conduct, and second to attempt to determine the *dominating* motive or motives in any given case, to know something of the principles of motivation in general."²¹ Subsequently, when he comes to deal with his heading, *Self Respect and the Ego-Ideal*, he says, "By virtue of being a distinct personality, each one has a specifically integrated self which he wants to express and realize. Self-respect as a motive means here being true to the ego-ideal in maintaining personal morale. In an intelligent, normal individual almost every act is motivated by a very subtle reference to the ideal, a reference to the type of character one wishes to become."²²

Professor Thomson takes a middle ground in his use of the term *ego-ideal*. Hadfield, in his *Psychology and Morals* uses the term in the singular, but personifies it more highly—Ideal, with a capital I. He says, "The adequate stimulus of will, the stimulus which is peculiarly adapted to rouse the self into activity, is the Ideal, that is the idea or object which leads to the complete realization of the whole individual. We have observed that the self is composed of a number of sentiments and dispositions organized together for a common purpose and to a common end. The ideal is that, the attainment of which, will produce completeness and happiness, which is the aim and purpose of the self. . . . In the absence of such an ideal our actions are left to the mercy of our impulses."²³ This point of view is more highly personified than that indicated by Professor Thomson, and more dynamically emotionalized. The varying uses of the term by these authors seem to indicate different points of view, partly temperamental, found in humanity in general and in the subjects of our study in particular. Some people have ideals, some have an ideal, while still others have an Ideal, supreme and unique. Some undoubtedly combine in varying degrees all three points of view.

Criteria for Rating Ideals.

Owing to the volatile and nebulous nature of ideals, no point system for rating them has been attempted. Yet the necessity for some sort of mental pattern or configuration in terms of which life is pictured is clear, and people can be divided into three groups, on the basis of their thinking in terms of ideals, an ego-ideal, or a mystical and transcendent Ideal. In general the ideals group are more objective minded, analytical and materialistic in temperament. They are often practical, good organizers, who undertake some definite task and carry it through. The ego-ideal group are forceful and concentrated, naturally egotistical, with a strong tendency to resist socialization. They are found largely among the individualistic and lonelier professions, such as historians, novelists, and inventors. The group with the mystical Ideal are temperamentally high strung and imaginative. In general they are less practical in the every-day affairs of life. Among them are found poets, religious leaders, educators, and artists. That the difference is largely temperamental, hence fixated, is indicated by the fact that certain of the subjects were brought up on one type of idealism, and when free to do so displayed consistently another of the three types.

The Ideals Group.

The ideals group are those whose moral ideas were distributive and generalized rather than personalized. George Washington had his rules of conduct and lived in remarkably close accord with them. He was a devoted churchman, and doubtless received much inspiration from his religious idealism; but in his own methodical life he thought largely in terms of specific characteristics. Thomas Jefferson is quoted as having written to Dr. Rush in 1803, "I am a Christian in the only sense in which he wished any one to be; sincerely attached to his doctrines in preference to all others; ascribing to himself all human excellence, and believing he never claimed any other. . . . His moral doctrines relating to kindred and

friends were more pure and perfect than those of the most perfect of the philosophers, inculcating universal philanthropy to all mankind, gathering all into one family under the bonds of love." Here we have the *locus classicus* among American writers of the ideals point of view. Benjamin Franklin thought likewise in these distributive terms. He wrote his aphorism in *Poor Richard's Almanac* as much for himself as for his readers; and in his personal religious ritual he included such questions as, "What good have I done this day."¹⁹ Probably Washington more than either of the others mentioned summed up life in one transcendent Ideal, yet he was essentially unmythical in temperament, of the humanist or moralist point of view in the practical affairs of life.

The Ego-Ideal.

Those who should be classed as motivated by an ego-ideal, as described by Thomson, would include Parkman, Motley, Mark Twain, Hawthorne, Poe, Clay; there are undoubtedly others, these are the more patent cases. Of Parkman, his biographer says in a chapter on *Spiritual Growth*, which shows little of what the writer would consider spirituality, "His promontory of a chin and his expression of firmness might well cause some apprehensions as to spiritual qualities. He appears to have recognized a danger in his own strength and firmness, as tending to a certain degree of hardness. It is easy to believe that this masterful spirit in early and middle life was not free from egotism." He quotes Parkman himself as saying, "A man must feel that he holds his fate in his own hands."²⁵ For Poe we need a more extended survey of his personal philosophy, but this brief quotation may serve—"A novel Universe swelling into existence, and then subsiding into nothingness, at every throb of the Divine Heart. And now this Divine Heart—what is it? It is our own."²⁶ Thus we see that Poe supported his egotism upon a fundamentally egoistic philosophy. Parkman curbed the egotism of his early and middle life,—in a measure became socialized, in part by

native good sense and of set purpose, in part he had it curbed for him by suffering and physical dependence on others. Poe made a religion of his egotism and suffered the consequences to the end of his short and unhappy life. Of the others like evidence could be cited to show that this group of men built their life about a certain ideal of the sort of man which they wished to become, which was and remained, not altogether a-social, but fundamentally ego centric. They were distinctly individualists, who considered a like highly developed individualism as desirable for others—of their own class.

The Mystical Ideal.

While some of the subjects of this study do not provide sufficient evidence to be classified on the subject of ideals, the largest single group, perhaps a majority of the whole, were actuated by one transcendent Ideal, which they would themselves have identified as the Christ. One would not necessarily assert that that Ideal in any marked degree resembled Jesus of Nazareth, as depicted in the New Testament. In a few cases it does so approximate, but in many others the subjects not only differed widely from the life and teachings of Jesus on such questions as non-resistance, loving their enemies, and race, social and economic attitudes, but they differed considerably among themselves. Yet this they had in common, that they were actuated by a personal Ideal, to whom they ascribed all excellence, whom they personified as the Christ, to whom they looked for spiritual inspiration, and of whom each had a more or less clay-footed *Ikon* in his inner consciousness, as the model of his individual life.

This transcendent Ideal is expressed in the words of Phillips Brooks, one who himself lived very close to his Ideal, when he says, "The very meaning of Christ's coming into the world is that He was a divinely human being in whom every high quality of man was shown forth in its perfection, so that all goodness thenceforth was to be but the copy of the life of Jesus Christ, the perfect man."²⁷ He expresses the

same idea in a new dynamic form in the well-known Christmas carol,

O Little Town of Bethlehem.
O holy child of Bethlehem,
Descend to us we pray;
Cast out our sin, and enter in,
Be born in us today.
We hear the Christmas angels
The great, glad tidings tell
O come to us, abide with us
Our Lord Emmanuel.

William Cullen Bryant expresses the same idea in his familiar hymn,

God's Well-beloved Son.
O Father haste the promised hour
When at His feet shall lie
All rule, authority, and power
Beneath the ample sky
When He shall reign from pole to pole,
The Lord of every human soul.

When all shall heed the words He said
Amid their daily cares,
And by the loving life He led
Shall seek to pattern theirs;
And He who conquered death shall win
The nobler conquest over sin.

Channing looks at life from a different angle from those just quoted, yet this motivation of the Ideal is essentially the same for him. He says, "I believe that Christianity has one great truth which is central, around which all other truths gather, and which constitutes it the Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God: It is the doctrine that God purposes in his unbounded Fatherly Love, *to perfect the human soul*; to purify it from all sin; to fill it with his own spirit; to enfold it forever;

I affirm that excellence of character is the great object of Christianity."²⁸ And again, "Come, Almighty Father, and crown with Thine omnipotence the humble strivings of Thy children to subvert oppression and wrong, to spread light and freedom, peace and joy, the truth and spirit of Thy Son, through the whole earth."²⁹

Though Oliver Wendell Holmes changed most of the tenets of his religion, as he made the shift from childhood to adult life, yet this personal Ideal remained central for him. After fifty years he wrote to Phineas Barnes, "It is trust in something better and wiser than we are, whether it comes to us in the inner life which we believe is the direct gift of the infinite spirit, or takes the human aspect in the person of him who brings the Divine, as it were, face to face with us."³⁰ Perhaps he better expresses the idea in his hymn

O Love Divine

O Love divine, that stoop'd to share
Our sharpest pang, our bitt'rest tear,
On Thee we cast each earth-born care,
We smile at pain while Thou art near.

James Russell Lowell gives expression to this Ideal, when he says, in an address on Democracy at Birmingham, England, "Christ was the first true democrat that ever breathed, . . . as He was the first true gentleman."

One might take an illustration of the case in point from almost any page of the *Letters of Mary Lyon*. She speaks for example of, "bringing every thought into captivity to the will of Christ," (quoting St. Paul) and again, "May I love in that manner which God will approve. I have been interested in the lovely and perfect example of Jesus Christ. Though He loved all His own as the world loveth not, and though He laid down His life for His enemies, yet as a man we have reason to think that He acknowledged some as His particular friends."³¹ Many others might be cited who expressed in one form or another this motivation of the mystical Ideal, whom

they identified with the Christ. It may be sufficient if we add by way of illustration these verses from Whittier's

Immortal Love

The healing of His seamless dress
Is by our beds of pain,
We touch Him in life's throng and press
And we are whole again.

Through Him the first fond prayers are said
Our lips of childhood frame,
The last low whispers of our dead,
Are burdened with His name.³²

The Nature and Development of Ideals.

An ideal, as illustrated in the lives studied and as discussed in this chapter, is a mental image or configuration of that which appears desirable to the mind. The ideal may exist objectively in part or as a whole, but to the mind of the idealizer it is subjective. The ideal is not an original datum, like the urge of hunger. A new born babe does not have one. The ideal is a growth, conditioned by experience, emotional satisfaction, and choice—that is by the media of education. One may have several subsidiary ideals, as the ideal mother, the ideal friend, the ideal society; but the paramount ideal which is the effective agent in character formation is the ideal of a possible self which one may become. The mechanism of the personal ideal operates through the common habit of living over in imagination the heroic part in the experiences of life. Anything may be grist to the ideals mill—stories read, heard, or acted, the gossip of the social set, the glory of the military or athletic hero. The cutting edge of the ideal is determined by the values which appeal to the individual. What does he want? The significant factor therefore for religious and character education is the values which motivate the ideal. Given the initially selfish individual, whose motivation is set up with reference to his own personal urges and

desires, the individual must pass through experiences in which he discovers that selfish individualism is possible only on the lower levels, and that the higher satisfactions are found in terms of social good. In other words, as the individual becomes socialized, he must have before him an ideal which is still more socialized, as a motivating force to determine the direction of his growth.

The process of socialization, which involves as we have just seen the discovery of a higher or more socialized ideal, corresponds to the variously described Christian experience of conversion which has in its essential features the reversal of central motivation from a self-centered to a God-centered, or society-centered, life. It is a process of cumulative experience which can be traced in the lives of very many of the characters studied. The subject has been briefly discussed, where the Beechers, Mary Lyon, and Jonathan Edwards are given as examples of the thirteen classed as "twice-born," in whose lives definite crises of experience, decision, or dedication are noted. There are twenty-six others of the once-born type, where the information is sufficient to trace their character development. In many of these cases the adoption of an ideal is associated in the mind of the individual with dedication to a task or program of socialization. Horace Mann, for example, declared that "the whole duty of man lay in knowing and doing the will of God." He found his ideal in the Christ, and he interpreted his duty as giving up his profession to devote his life to popular education. Mary Lyon went through a definite experience in which she adopted the Christ ideal, during her school days. Her great and effectual labors in the field of women's education were in large measure motivated by her religious ideal. On the occasion of her thirty-sixth birthday, she wrote in a letter, "As long as the Lord of the vineyard hath any need of my feeble service, He will allow me the unspeakable privilege of living and laboring."³³ We note that each character used as an illustration in the two preceding paragraphs to represent persons with the mystical ideal

was highly socialized, with a mark above 80%, and an average on the socialization table of 90%. A significant factor in the religious ideals of all this group is the fact that they conceived the ideal in social,—i.e., family terms, of the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of man, and Christ the elder brother.

Purpose.

Like Mary Lyon and Horace Mann, others of the characters studied dedicated their lives to a set purpose. It now remains for us to consider the significance of *Purpose* as a factor in religious and character education. Purpose is related to ideal, but should not be confounded with the ideal, as is sometimes done. The ideal is the total entity, the ideally completed whole, of that which one considers desirable. The purpose is that part in life which the individual undertakes toward the realization of the ideal. It is evident that certain of the characters drifted into or stumbled upon their purpose, or were driven to it by negative force of circumstance. It seems equally evident that no one of them reached any great achievement—and all of them did achieve—without at some previous time resolving upon a major purpose. This appears in its simplest form in the case of the inventors. We see Elias Howe in the chronometer shop of Ari Davis, listening to the “crank” who was trying to invent a knitting machine, and resolving himself to make a machine that would sew. Here was a purpose which changed young Elias from an aimless and drifting mechanic to one of the world’s greatest benefactors. The purpose of Howe was motivated in part by self-interest; yet in the degree that the proposed achievement had social and socializing value, in that degree only could he succeed. He succeeded ultimately in making clothing cheaper for all humanity—one of the most significant of social achievements. In his success, he also fulfilled his duty toward his long-suffering family. Incidentally he became rich and famous—rewards which no one should wish to deny him; though the reward should never be allowed to overshadow the achieve-

ment of the purpose. Like moments to that of Elias Howe, resolving upon a purpose, with corresponding results, may be seen in the lives of Eli Whitney, when he decided to develop the cotton gin, and of Samuel F. B. Morse in determining to produce an electric telegraph. The motivation was in each case clearly divided between a desire to accomplish something worth while for humanity, the desire to succeed, and the desire for economic gain.

Where sufficient motivation does not appear, we may conclude that we do not understand the character under review. Herndon's story of Lincoln's watching the slave market in New Orleans and deciding that if he ever got a chance he would "hit this thing and hit it hard," has been exaggerated by others into the major motivation of Lincoln's life, which resulted in his becoming President and destroying slavery.³⁴ It is only when we see Lincoln's repeated contact with the undesirable features of slavery, as in the Russell-Todd law case in his own family, that we understand his slowly maturing purpose.³⁵ Lincoln, who tried many tasks, and failed in several of them, is a conspicuous example of the trial and error method, and of slow growth of a major purpose in life.

Louis Agassiz' expressed intention to "become the first scientist in Europe," represents another type of purposive motivation. It was a youthful resolve, expressed in egoistic terms, but based upon the sound principle of fitting himself as well as possible for a career of service. In the socializing process through which he was himself passing, the achievement of his purpose lost itself in his larger ideal. When offered the highest scientific post at the University of Paris, which was the fulfillment of his original purpose, he declined, and chose rather to teach in America. In the lives of other teachers, particularly of Emma Hart Willard, we see a great socializing purpose take shape,—when she devoted her life to the preparation of women teachers to teach women—and children—for the furtherance of culture in the country. She was impelled in

part by the economic motive to support herself and her family. But her purpose soon transcended the economic motive. Thereafter she was no longer driven by necessity, but was led by a contagious enthusiasm. Herein may lie the secret of the much mooted question of leadership,—the true leader develops when economic necessity and selfish pride are transcended by enthusiastic purpose.

Religion and Purpose.

The relation of religion and purpose has already emerged in the discussion of ideals. Religion represents value which gives meaning to the relationships of life. It is difficult to separate motives, ideals, and purposes, from religion, and in a sense, whether the person concerned uses the term religion or not, it is applicable to this whole field of values. In certain cases studied, including the lives of all the ministers, a highly socialized life purpose was definitely related to the Ideal of religion. In cases classed as "twice-born" a part of the irruptive religious experience, connected with the adoption of the ideal, was the determination of a major purpose. It seems likely that the irruptive aspect was in part due to the struggle of competing and mutually inconsistent urges for supremacy in the life of the individual.

The Development of a Purpose.

The development of a dominant purpose seems to be one of the first requisites of a successful life, yet many people pass through their secondary education and enter a University without having determined upon any set purpose. Effective education should lead to the formation of a purpose; and until the purpose is formulated, education itself is crippled. It seems to be no small part of the success of the lives studied that so many of these persons early formulated a workable, if not an ultimate, purpose. Agassiz has just been referred to. Despite the pressure put upon him, for prudential reasons, to become a physician, he early decided to be a scientist. Details

as to which particular branch of natural science he should follow, whether geology or biology, were left to be worked out. Agassiz was perhaps the best equipped man in the world in his line, due to his native ability, together with his early formulation of his purpose.

In addition to the importance of the early development of purpose, a purpose suited to one's capacities should be found. The persons included upon this list all ultimately succeeded in some major field of endeavor; yet even with these brilliant persons numerous occupational difficulties are found. One thinks of Audubon, with his artistic temperament and love of the birds, and the fiery Patrick Henry, as selling groceries and measuring calico and then forgetting to charge the customer because their heart and mind were elsewhere. Grant never did find his true *métier*, which lay in the field of mathematics; he won the Civil War out of sheer desperation and sense of failure. He had stipulated with his destiny, when he dared not face his father's anger, and went to study at West Point. One of the greatest needs in our educational life is for courage, despite fear, uncertainty, and parental or economic pressure, to choose that for which one's own inner consciousness tells him he is best fitted.

Determination in Carrying out a Purpose.

Once a choice has been made on adequate grounds, a purpose should be adhered to with grim determination—so Foster tells us in his *Decision of Character*. This book of Foster's is one that is mentioned occasionally as among those which influenced the character of some of the persons studied. It represents a type of literature somewhat out of style today, which seems to have had positive values, and of which we lack a modern counterpart. Such books had their part in emotionally conditioning their readers to a high sense of destiny—to a sense of worth in the sight of God, and to a like worth of their fellow men, even the meanest. We have seen that the Calvinists and Puritans, who were brought up

on this point of view, produced a large percent of those who have been chosen to the Hall of Fame. It seems that this emotional conditioning of the individuals in an expectation of the divine support and a determination to succeed because of the great values at stake must have been a significant factor in the success of some of the persons whose lives have been studied. The sense of value of one's self as an individual, and of every individual, of one's calling and tasks, and of all simple tasks and callings, is one of the greatest motivating forces in life. The sense of values becomes socialized when the feeling of the importance of one's own purpose is matched by a growing sense of the importance of other people's purposes and of the intrinsic worth of all people in the Heart of the Universe. A high sense of the importance of carrying out one's purpose comes with the conviction that that purpose is in harmony with the processes of nature—with the will of God—that in fulfilling one's own purpose he is cooperating with God in perfecting his world.

CONCLUSIONS

The significant factors in the ancestry and social inheritance of the persons whose lives have been studied, and which emerge in this study, are largely in the field of education and religious and character training. Certain hereditary and economic features appear, such as the fact that the ancestors beyond the Atlantic, of the group studied, came largely from the upper and upper middle classes; and that comparative poverty in childhood, with consequent economy and with chores to be done in helping about the home, was a socializing, hence desirable factor. It has not been found possible, however, in this study to measure with any degree of accuracy the intelligence factor of the individuals or their ancestors, beyond establishing the fact that the individuals were normal or above without being predominantly precocious; nor have the economic factors been sufficiently isolated that the writer would wish to make any significant generalizations in that

field. But in the fields of education and of religious and character training a number of factors emerge, which appear significant to the mind of the writer. These factors can be noted by the careful reader at the point where they emerge in the text. The more important of them may be summarized as follows:

Clearly Evident.

1. The extension of the socializing process, from the naturally selfish individual, to a motivation directed toward the abundant life for society, is central to character education.

2. A harmonious relationship of the child with the mother, with the parents, and with the family, is the beginning of the socializing process, a failure in which signally mars the later life of the individual. Illustrations, positive—Bancroft, Whittier, Alice Freeman Palmer; negative—Franklin, Clemens, Poe.

3. Discipline leading to self direction is a necessary precursor to self-expression. Successful external discipline is moderate, even handed, and gradually relaxing. In the best instances there is a definite policy of transfer of control from the parent to the growing child. Under self-discipline a desirable objective can be chosen and pursued. Illustrations, positive, Joseph Story, Frances Willard; negative, Poe, Grant, Sherman, Audubon.

4. Lack of discipline, uneven discipline, over-severe discipline, unrelenting discipline, leave scars and character weaknesses. Illustrations, Poe, Clemens, St. Gaudens, Grant.

Probably Evident.

5. Integration between the home, the church, the school, extends the socializing process in widening circles of interest, understanding, and contact. In the degree that there is conflict between the directions, tendencies, and teachings of any two of these three, the conflict is reflected in the life of the individual. Illustrations, positive, Brooks, Alice Freeman Palmer; negative, Mann, Jefferson, Irving, Holmes.

6. Socialization, which follows successful discipline, leads to higher satisfactions, and the development of the self on a higher level. Illustrations, Patrick Henry, Frances Willard, George Bancroft.

Possibly Evident.

7. The pursuit of a personalized ideal, who sacrifices or limits himself for the common good, leads to the development of a clearly-defined, socialized personality. Such an ideal may be a father, a mother, an older living person, or a spiritual Ideal of religion. In varying degrees, but in many instances among the characters studied this Ideal is conceived of as the Christ. Examples, the mother of Lincoln, of Henry Ward Beecher; the Christ ideal of Mary Lyon, of Whittier, of Henry Ward Beecher, of Channing.

8. The motivation of the ideal is the growing point for religious and character education, where the socializing process can be stimulated and directed. Illustrations, Mary Lyon, Emma Willard, Roger Williams, Joseph Henry.

9. The significant factor for religious and character education is the value which motivates the ideal. Religion expressed in social terms—the Fatherhood of God, Jesus the Elder Brother, the Brotherhood of Man, and of the whole human race,—has socializing value and may be an effective framework in which to build social institutions. Illustrations, Washington, Mark Hopkins, Franklin, Horace Mann.

¹ Troth, D. C., *Selected Readings in Character Education*. Boston, The Beacon Press, 1930, p. 348.

² Emerson, Ralph W., *Essays*, Philadelphia, John W. Morris and Company, 1906. Character, p. 324.

³ Pierce, Edgar, *The Philosophy of Character*. Harvard Press, 1924, p. 413.

⁴ Hartshorne, Hugh, and May, M. A., *Personality and Character Tests*, Off print from the Psychological Bulletin, vol. 23, No. 7, July, 1926.

⁵ Roback, A. A., *The Psychology of Character*. New York, Harcourt and Brace, 1928.

⁶ Smuts, Jan C., *Holism and Evolution*. New York, The Mac-Millan Company, 1926, p. 289.

⁷ Dewey, John, *Human Nature and Conduct*, p. 38.

⁸ Jung, C. G., *Modern Man in Search of A Soul*, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1933, Chap. XI.

⁹ Hartshorne, Hugh, *Character in Human Relations*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932, p. 125ff.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 174-5.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 184-5.

¹² Confucius, *Analects*, Edited by James Legge. Shanghai, Commercial Press, n.d., Book I, Chap. IV, 1-6.

¹³ *Experiments in Measuring Motives*. The writer has tried numerous experiments and varied systems of indicating motivation before coming to the one which is now proposed. Much time was spent in trying to perfect a configuration of motivation patterns, based upon the fundamental instincts of the race, which demand satisfaction in the life of each individual. His mind still turns in that direction, as a promising field for investigation, but so far no satisfactory system of motivation patterns for application in these biographical studies has been devised. Among the other experiments tried was a complicated hundred-point system for measuring the degree of socialized behavior. In addition to its cumbersomeness, it had the further disadvantage of emphasizing in the resultant differences dependant more upon occupation, education, and economic status than upon character.

¹⁴ Thwaites, Reuben G., *Daniel Boone*. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1903, p. 181. "Daniel then fled, stopping once to load and kill another foe."

¹⁵ Allen, A. V. G., *Jonathan Edwards*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1889, p. 12.

¹⁶ Allen, A. V. G., *op. cit.* p. 191, p. 279.

¹⁷ Iles, George, *Leading American Inventors*. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1912, p. 94. In 1785 five bags of cotton were landed at Liverpool. By 1788 this had increased to 108 bags. Whitney invented his gin in 1793. By 1825, the year of Whitney's death, the cotton exported from the United States was valued at \$36,846,000.00, which exceeded by six millions of dollars the value of all other exports combined. This figure continued to mount rapidly until the Civil War.

¹⁸ Woodberry, G. E., *Edgar Allen Poe*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1885, p. 14. "At the age of six. . . the long,

narrow Virginia table cleared for dessert, being his stage, his trick before company was to pledge their health."

¹⁹ Roback, A. A., *Psychology of Character*, already referred to is a compendious historical survey of 576 pages, dealing with the "humors," with temperament, with the endocrine attack upon the problem, and most of the other possible approaches. The question of religion and character is scarcely referred to, but the ethical and biographical sides of the subject are interestingly treated. It is, on the whole, the most valuable modern treatise on the subject which the writer has consulted. Another book of great value, suggestive throughout, and brilliant in spots, is Coe's *Motives of Men*. The writer has found no single book in the field which he could apply closely to the study of motivation in the biographical subjects.

²⁰ Thorndike, E. L., *The Elements of Psychology*. New York A. G. Seiler, 1905, p. 263.

²¹ Thomson, M. K., *Springs of Human Action*. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1927, p. 13.

²² *Op. cit.* p. 226.

²³ Hadfield, J. A., *Psychology and Morals*. New York, Robert McBride & Co., 1925, p. 101.

²⁴ Franklin, Benjamin, *Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1916, p. 155.

²⁵ Farnham, C. H., *A Life of Francis Parkman*. Boston, Little Brown & Co., 1901, pp. 333-5.

²⁶ Poe, E. A., Works, vol. II, *Eureka, An Essay, on the Material and Spiritual Universe*. p. 211.

²⁷ Allen, A. V. G., *Life of Phillips Brooks*, New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1907, p. 179.

²⁸ Chadwick, J. W., *William Ellery Channing, Minister of Religion*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1903, p. 224.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 418.

³⁰ Morse, J. T., Jr., *Life and Letters of Oliver Wendell Holmes*. Cambridge, Riverside Press, 1896, p. 283.

³¹ Kingsbury, O. R., *The Power of Christian Benevolence*. American Tract Society, 1858, p. 61.

³² *Church Hymnal*. New York, The Century Co., 1915, No. 194. All hymns quoted above are from this volume.

³³ *Life of Mary Lyon*, p. 119.

³⁴ Herndon, *Lincoln*, vol. I, p. 76.

³⁵ Townsend, *Lincoln and His Wife's Home Town*, Chap. XI.

Bibliography

- Adams, E. D., *The Power of Ideals in American History*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1913.
- 'a Kempis, Thomas, *Of the Imitation of Christ, Four Books*. London, Walter Scott, Limited, n.d.
- Same. London, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1900.
- Alexander, Archibald, *Theories of the Will in the History of Philosophy*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898.
- Allen, Alexander, V. G., *Religious Progress*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1894.
- Allport, F. H., *Social Psychology*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1924.
- Allport and Allport, *Personality Traits, Their Classification and Measurement*. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, vol. XVI, April, 1921.
- Annett, E. A., *Psychology for Bible Teachers*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
- Athearn, W. S., *Indiana Survey of Religious Education: Three Religious Education Schedules*. New York, George H. Doran Company, 1924.
- Bacon, Sir Francis, *Bacon's Essays and Colours of Good and Evil*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1892. (With notes and glossarial index by W. Aldis Wright). 1st edition, 1596.
- Bailey, John W., *Christianity a Way of Life and Belief*. Philadelphia, The Judson Press, 1927.
- Baldwin, J. M., *Development and Evolution*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1902.
- Barrett, E. B., *Motive Forces and Motivation Tracks*. London, Longmans Green and Company, 1911.
- Benedict, I. H., *The Great Problem*. Boston, Sherman, French and Company, 1911, (Chapters on Democracy, Social Moral Consciousness, Work, Happiness, Saviorhood, etc.).

- Bernard, H. M., *Some Neglected Factors in Evolution, An Essay on Constructive Biology*. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.
- Betts, George H., *How to Teach Religion, Principles and Methods*. New York, The Abingdon Press, 1919.
- Betts, George H., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*. New York, The Abingdon Press, 1924.
- Botsford, J. B., *English Society in the Eighteenth Century, as Influenced from Oversea*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1924. (Chapter V, The Rise of the Middle Class).
- Bourdillon, F., *A Help to Family Worship, or, Some Forms of Morning and Evening Prayer for Four Weeks*. London, The Religious Tract Society, n.d., (First and Second Series Complete).
- Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
- Brown, Charles R., and Others, *Education for Christian Service*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1922. By Members of the Faculty of the Divinity School of Yale University.
- Brown, John, *The English Puritans*. Cambridge, The University Press, 1910.
- Bunyan, John, *The Pilgrim's Progress*. London, George Rutledge Sons, 1864.
- Clarke, James E., *Education for Successful Living*. Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1922.
- Coe, George A., *The Motives of Men*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
- Confucius, Kung Fu-tzu, *Confucian Analects*, Shanghai, Commercial Press, n.d. (Translated and edited by James Legge).
- Conklin, E. G., *The Direction of Human Evolution*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.
- Conklin, E. G., *The Implications for Religion of Present Trends in Psychology, From Religion in Higher Education*. Edited by Milton C. Towner. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Conn, H. W., *The Method of Evolution*. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900.

- Davies, J. L., and Vaughn, D. J., *The Republic of Plato*. London, Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1906.
- Davis, J. E., *Jamestown and Her Neighbors on Virginia's Historic Peninsula*. Richmond, Garrett and Massie, Inc., 1928.
- Dawson, W. S., *Aids to Psychiatry*. New York, William Wood and Company, 1929.
- Denison, J. H., *Emotion as the Basis of Civilization*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
- Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- Dewey, John, *Reconstruction in Philosophy*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1920.
- Drake, S. A., *Our Great Benefactors, Short Biographies of the Men and Women Most Eminent in Literature, Science, Philanthropy, Art, etc.*, Boston, Roberts Brothers, 1884. (Contains sketches of 12 of our subjects, on some of whom information is particularly scanty. Valuable for Morton and Elias Howe).
- Eddington, A. S., *The Nature of the Physical World*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Edman, Irwin, *Human Traits and Their Social Significance*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1919.
- Ellwood, C. A., *Christianity and Social Science, A Challenge to the Church*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, *Essays*. Philadelphia, John W. Morris and Company, 1906, Including Spiritual Laws, The Over-soul, Character, The Conduct of Life, Worship, Power, etc.
- Forbush, W. B., *The Coming Generation*. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1913.
- Fosdick, Harry Emerson, *Christianity and Progress*. New York, Association Press, 1922.
- Foster, John, *Decision of Character*. New York, Association Press.
- Freud, Sigmund, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis, Translated by G. Stanley Hall*. New York, Boni and Liveright, 1920.

- Foxe, John, *The Book of Martyrs, A History of the Persecution of the Protestants*. London, James Nisbet and Co., Limited, n.d.
- Gates, Arthur I., *Psychology for Students of Education*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1931 (Revised edition).
- Griffis, W. E., *The Story of the Walloons at Home, in Lands of Exile and in America*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1923.
- Hadfield, J. A., *Psychology and Morals, An Analysis of Character*. New York, Robert M. McBride and Company, 1925.
- Haldane, J. S., *Mechanism, Life and Personality, An Examination of the Mechanistic Theory of Life and Mind*. 2nd edition. New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1923.
- Hall, T. C., *The Religious Background of American Culture*. Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1930.
- Hartshorne, Hugh, *Childhood and Character, An Introduction to the Study of the Religious Life of Children*. Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1919.
- Hartshorne, Hugh, and May, J. A., *Testing the Knowledge of Right and Wrong*. Religious Education, 1926, p. 21.
- Hirst, E. W., *Self and Neighbor, An Ethical Study*. London, Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1919.
- Hollingsworth, H. L., *Vocational Psychology and Character Analysis*. New York, D. Appleton and Co., 1929.
- Holmes, Arthur, *Principles of Character Making*. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1913.
- Horne, H. H., *Christ in Man Making*. New York, The Abingdon Press, 1926.
- Hudson, C. E., *Recent Psychology and the Christian Religion*. New York, George H. Doran Company, 1923.
- Hyde, W. DeW., *Practical Idealism*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1905.
- Iles, George, *Leading American Inventors*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1912. (Including: Robert Fulton, Eli Whitney, Samuel F. B. Morse, Elias Howe).
- Inge, W. R., *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*. London, Long-

- mans, Green and Co., 1907, (The Paddock Lectures for 1906).
- Jacks, L. P., *Constructive Citizenship*. New York, Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1928.
- James, William, *The Principles of Psychology*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1904, 2 vols.
- James, William, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1925.
- Jastrow, Joseph, *Character and Temperament*. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1915.
- *Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council*. New York, International Missionary Council, 1928, 8 vols., vol. II, Religious Education, Edited by Luther Weigle.
- Johnson, F. W., *The Problems of Boyhood*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1914.
- Jordan, David S., Editor, *Leading American Men of Science*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1910. (Including: Witmer, S., John James Audubon, Newcomb, S., Joseph Henry, Holder, C. F., Louis Agassiz, Coulter, J. M., Asa Gray).
- Jordan, David Starr, and Kimball, Sarah Louise, *Your Family Tree*. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1929.
- Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1896, (Translated into English by F. Max Muller, Centenary Edition).
- Kent, C. F., *The Fundamentals of Christianity*. Philadelphia, The Press of the University of Pennsylvania, 1925, (The George Dana Boardman Lectureship in Christian Ethics).
- Kidd, Benjamin, *The Science of Power*. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918. (Chapter V, The Emotion of the Ideal, Chapter X, Social Heredity).
- Kirbye, J. Edward, *Puritanism in the South*. Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1908.
- Kilpatrick, W. H., *Foundations of Method*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1925.
- King, Henry Churchill, *Personal and Ideal Elements in Education*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1915, 3d edition.

- King, Henry Churchill, Peabody, F. G., and others, *Education and National Character*. Chicago, The Religious Education Association, 1908.
- King, Henry Churchill, *The Greatness and Simplicity of the Christian Faith*. Boston, Pilgrim Press, 1906.
- Koffka, Kurt, *The Growth of the Mind, An Introduction to Child Psychology*, Translated by Robert Morris Ogden. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1925.
- Köhler, Wolfgang, *Gestalt Psychology*. New York, Horace Liveright, 1929.
- Lecky, W. E. H., *History of European Morals*. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1929, 2 vols., 3d edition revised.
- Mallock, W. H., *Studies in Contemporary Superstition*. London, Ward and Downey Limited, 1895.
- Marshall, H. R., *Mind and Conduct*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919, (Morse Lectures Delivered at the Union Theological Seminary in 1919).
- Martin, E. D., *The Meaning of a Liberal Education*. New York, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1926.
- May, Mark A., and Hartshorne, Hugh, *Personality and Character Tests*. Off print from the Psychological Bulletin, vol. 23, No. 7, July, 1826.
- McCunn, John, *The Making of Character*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1900.
- McDougall, William, *Ethics and Some Modern World Problems*. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924.
- Meumann, E., *The Psychology of Learning*. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1913.
- Montague, Wm. P., *The Ways of Knowing*. London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1925.
- Moran, Hugh A., *Heroes, A Study for School Boys of the Principles of Christianity as Illustrated in the Lives of Great Men and Women*. New York, Association Press, 1919.
- Murray, J. M., *Jesus Man of Genius*. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1926.

- Myerson, Abraham, *The Foundations of Personality*. Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1927.
- National Education Association, *Sixth Year Book, The Development of the High School Curriculum*. Washington, D. C., The Department of Superintendence of the N. E. A., 1928.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *A Genealogy of Morals, The Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, Edited by Alexander Tille*, vol. X, Translated by W. A. Haussmann. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1907.
- Overstreet, Harry A., *Influencing Human Behavior*. New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1925.
- Page, Kirby, and Others, *Christianity and Economic Problems*. New York, Association Press, 1922.
- Parker, DeW. H., *The Self and Nature*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1917.
- Peabody, Francis G., *Jesus Christ and the Christian Character, An Examination of the Teaching of Jesus in its Relation to Some of the Moral Problems of Personal Life*. New York, Hodder and Stoughton, 1905. (The Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University, 1904.)
- Pierce, Edgar, *The Philosophy of Character*. Cambridge, Harvard Press, 1924.
- Pintner, Rudolf, *Intelligence Testing, Methods and Results*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1923.
- Plato, *Republic*, See Davies.
- Pollock, Robert, *The Course of Time, A Poem with a Memoir of the Author*. Philadelphia, James Kay, Jun. and Brother, 1839.
- Pratt, James B., *Matter and Spirit, A Study of Mind and Body in their Relation to the Spiritual Life*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1922.
- Randall, J. H. Jr., *Our Changing Civilization*. New York, Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1930.
- Rignano, Eugenio, *Upon the Inheritance of Acquired Characters, Authorized English Translation by Basil C. H. Hervey*. Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Co., 1911.

- Roback, A. A., *Bibliography of Character and Personality, Containing 3341 Titles in Many Languages*. Cambridge, Sci-Art Publishers, 1927.
- Roback, A. A., *The Psychology of Character*. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928.
- Roback, A. A., *Popular Psychology*. Cambridge, Sci-Art Publishers, 1928. Part III, Character Analysis.
- Robinson, James Harvey, *The Mind in the Making*. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1921.
- School Betterment Studies. Pittsburgh, Henry C. Frick Educational Commission, n.d. 7 vols.
- | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Youth and the True.</i> | <i>Youth and the Good.</i> |
| <i>What Pittsburgh High School</i> | <i>Character.</i> |
| <i>Seniors Read.</i> | <i>What is Education.</i> |
| <i>What Pittsburgh Junior High</i> | <i>Emotion.</i> |
| <i>School Pupils Read.</i> | |
- Schweitzer, Albert, *Civilization and Ethics*, (Translated by John Naish). London, A. and C. Black, Ltd., 1923.
- Shand, A. F., *The Foundations of Character*. London, Macmillan and Company, 1914.
- Shedd, W. G. T., *The Confessions of Augustine, Edited with an Introduction*. Andover, Warren F. Draper, 1877.
- Shoup, F. A., *Mechanism and Personality*. Boston, Ginn and Co., 1891.
- Simkhovitch, V. G., *Toward an Understanding of Jesus*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1924, 2nd edition.
- Smith, Gerald B., *The Principles of Christian Living*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1924.
- Smuts, Jan C., *The Right Honorable General, Holism and Evolution*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1926.
- Squires, W. A., *Psychological Foundations of Religious Education*. Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1926.
- Stewart, George, Jr., *A History of Religious Education in Connecticut to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1924.

- Stewart, H. L., *Questions of the Day in Philosophy and Psychology*. London, Edward Arnold, 1912. (Chapter on the Interpretation of Genius).
- Swete, H. B., *The Apostles' Creed*. Cambridge, The University Press, 1905.
- Taylor, Charles K., *Character Development, A Practical Graded School Course*. Philadelphia, The John C. Winston Company, 1913.
- Terman, L. M., *The Measurement of Intelligence*. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1916.
- Thompson, J. Arthur, *The Outline of Science*. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922. 4 vols.
- Thomson, M. K., *The Springs of Human Action*. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1927.
- Thorndike, E. L., *The Elements of Psychology*. New York, A. G. Seiler, 1905.
- Thurstone, L. L., *The Nature of Intelligence*. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1924.
- Thwing, C. F., *The Family, An Historical and Social Study*. Boston, Lothrop, Lee and Shepard Co., 1913.
- Towner, M. C., Ed., *Religion in Higher Education*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Troth, D. C., *Selected Readings in Character Education*. Boston, The Beacon Press, 1930.
- Vieth, P. H., *Objectives in Religious Education*. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1930.
- Ward, Harry F., *Our Economic Morality and the Ethics of Jesus*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1929.
- Ward, Harry F., *The New Social Order, Principles and Programs*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1919.
- Watson, Goodwin B., *Experimentation and Measurement in Religious Education*. New York, Association Press, 1927.
- Watson, Goodwin B., and Gladys H., *Case Studies for Teachers of Religion*. New York, Association Press, 1920.
- Watson, Goodwin and Spence, R. B., *Educational Problems for Psychological Study*. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1930.

- Watson, Goodwin B., *The Measurement of Fairmindedness*. New York, Teachers College, 1925.
- Watson, John B., *Behaviorism*. New York, The People's Institute Publishing Company, Inc., 1924, 1925.
- Wharton, A. H., *English Ancestral Homes of Noted Americans*. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1915.
- Whitehead, A. N., *Religion in the Making*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1926, (Lowell Lectures, 1926).
- Whitehead, A. N., *Science and the Modern World*. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1926, (Lowell Lectures, 1925).
- Wiggam, A. E., *The Fruit of the Family Tree*. Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1924.
- Woodworth, R. S., *Psychology, A Study of Mental Life*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1924.
- Young, Edward, *The Complaint, or Night Thoughts and the Force of Religion*. Portland, Sanborn and Carter, 1846.

APPENDIX

COLLEGE GRADUATES

Dorchester, Daniel, D. D., *Christianity in the United States*.

Hunt and Eaton, 1895.

p. 250.

Years	Harvard	Yale	Princeton	Columbia	Brown	Dartmouth
1638-1700	446					
1700-1710	122	32				
1711-1720	151	56				
1721-1730	365	141				
1731-1740	312	179				
1741-1750	239	219	19			
1751-1760	270	290	142	17		
1761-1770	422	325	192	52	11	
1771-1776	278	176	137	42	42	43

William and Mary College no list.

TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

Dorchester, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

Dr. Asabel Hooker instructed thirty-three students for the ministry; Dr. Charles Backus instructed about fifty; Dr. Asa Burton about 60; Dr. Bellamy still more, and Dr. Emmons one hundred. Dr. Smalley had in his home only some twenty-five or thirty, but among them was Dr. Emmons himself, Honorable Oliver Ellsworth, third Chief Justice of the United States and Jeremiah Mason, U. S. Senator from New Hampshire, both, on leaving Yale College, studied for a time with Dr. Smalley.

CHURCH STATISTICS

Dorchester, *op. cit.*, p. 253ff.

From a discourse preached by the Reverend Ezra Stiles, D. D., before the Congregational Clergy of Rhode Island,

April 23, 1760, a number of interesting particulars have been collected respecting the ecclesiastical condition of New England (See American Quarterly Register, August, 1834, pp. 20-26). The following was, as he supposed, the condition of the different sects: Jews, 70 persons; Moravians, 70 persons; Episcopalians, 2100 families, or 12,600 souls. There were twenty-seven Episcopal missions, including two "itinerances." The twenty-seven missionaries, with three other ministers, officiated in forty-seven churches and places of divine worship. Six or seven of the congregations were large, others were small, some not exceeding fifteen or twenty families each. Friends, 16,000, a large estimate; Baptists 22,000.

"At present," said Dr. Stiles, "The Congregationalists have about 530 churches, which double in less than thirty years. The aged ministers now living have in their day seen 130 churches increase to 530. In 1643 the 15,000 souls in New England were contained in thirty-four churches. In 1650 there were forty churches, and 7,750 communicants. Perhaps these may now be (1760) 60,000 to 70,000 communicants. In 1698 there were 130 churches of which thirty-five were in Connecticut. Now there are 530 churches, of which 170 are in Connecticut, hence the period of doubling for the churches is thirty years at the farthest. In one hundred fifteen years we have increased five hundred churches upon thirty-four churches."

Accompanying this discourse there is a list of the clergy of New England, each given by name with his residence and denominational relations, from which the following table has been compiled:

Clergy in New England in 1760

<i>Denominations</i>	<i>Maine</i>	<i>N. H.</i>	<i>Mass.</i>	<i>R. I.</i>	<i>Conn.</i>	<i>Total</i>
Congregational	24	29	291	11	165	520
Presbyterian		4	2		2	8
Episcopalian		2	16	6	24	48
Baptist			20	19	3	42
Friends	3	4	15	24	1	49
	27	39	344	60	195	665

Churches in New York, 1771.

Dorchester, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

Number of inhabitants of colony, estimated 130,000.

Dutch Reformed—23 ministers considered large congregations
two or three churches per minister

24 vacant

Presbyterian—45 Presbyterian ministers. 42 fixed charges.
15 vacancies.

Episcopalian—21 clergy

Lutheran — 3 ministers—10 vacancies

Anabaptists—12 ministers—4 vacancies

French Protestants—2 congregations

Moravians— 3 congregations

Quakers —17 “

Jews — 1 “

Roman Catholic—None

The Middle States, 1759 (American Quarterly Register, August 1834, p. 26).

Presbyterian 8 Presbyterian—99 ministers (Duplicates)

Dutch Reformed 1 Synod 20 ministers (Duplicates)

Baptist New Jersey 5 ministers; Pennsylvania 4.

Episcopalian New Jersey 5 ministers; Pennsylvania 4.

p. 255

English Missionaries in America in 1762.

The Society for Propagating the Gospel employed the following number of missionaries in this country:

Massachusetts	8	New Jersey	8
New Hampshire	1	Pennsylvania	9
Connecticut	16	North Carolina	5
Rhode Island	4	South Carolina	4
New York	10	Georgia and Bahama	2

Total, sixty-seven missionaries, besides about a dozen school masters.

Statistics of churches and ministers in the United States, 1775 (Religion in America by the Reverend Robert Baird, D. D., New York, Harper 1856, p. 210).

	<i>Men</i>	<i>Churches</i>
Episcopalians	250	300
Baptists	350	380
Congregationalists	575	700
Presbyterians	140	300
Lutherans	25	60
German Reformed	25	60
Dutch Reformed	25	60
Associates	13	20
Moravians	12	8
Methodists	20	30
Roman Catholics	26	52
	<hr/> 1,461	<hr/> 1,970

POPULATION IN THE COLONIAL ERA

Seaman, *Essays in the Progress of the Nations*. New York, Scribner's 1852, pp. 579-583.

	1637	1654	1665	1700	1750	1775
Maine				4,000	16,000	45,000
New Hampshire				10,000	30,000	90,000
Vermont					10,000	40,000
Mass.	7,912	16,026	23,467	6,000	190,000	280,000
Plymouth	549	2,941	5,3206			
Rhode Island		1,959		1,000	32,000	50,000
Connecticut		3,186		30,000	110,000	195,000
New York			10,000	18,000	72,000	175,000
New Jersey				15,000	60,000	120,000
Pennsylvania				15,000	130,000	275,000
Delaware				5,000	20,000	35,000
Maryland	400		16,000	25,000	90,000	160,000
Virginia	20,000		30,000	75,000	200,000	360,000
North Carolina				8,000	80,000	200,000
South Carolina				7,000	50,000	90,000
Georgia					10,000	25,000
Total White				288,000		2,140,000
Free Colored and Slaves				37,000		500,000
						<hr/> 2,640,000

RELIGIOUS FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES

Census of 1906, Carroll, H. K., LL.D., Director of Churches,
U. S. Census, Scribner's, 1912.

p. LIX

Male members	12,767,466
Female members	16,849,505
Value	1,257,575,867
Sunday School	14,685,997

Average membership per church (1906)

Roman Catholic—1,017; Lutheran—188; Presbyterian—119;
Baptist—113; Methodist—96.

Protestant figures for 1880	1890	Increase
9,263,234	13,158,363	3,895,129
Increase in church membership 1880-1890		42%
Increase in population		24.86%

p. XXXVIII.

Roman Catholic 1881	Estimate 6,367,330 communicants
1891	Estimate 8,277,039
Increase	30%

Net increase despite immigration "far below that of the Protestant Churches."

(H.A.M.—1921 ca. 17,000,000 at 30% increase each ten years).

p. LXI Seating capacity, Roman Catholic $\frac{1}{3}$ of communicants
Methodists 3 times

p. LXXV

1910 Roman Catholics (3 bodies)	12,443,520
Methodist (16 bodies)	6,615,052
Baptist (15 bodies)	5,603,137
Lutheran (23 bodies)	2,243,486
Presbyterian (12 bodies)	1,920,765
Disciples (2 bodies)	1,464,774
Episcopalian (2 bodies)	938,390

Reformed (4 bodies)	448,190
Latter Day Saints (2)	400,650
Eastern Orthodox	385,000
United Brethren (2)	303,319
Evangelical (2)	182,065
Friends (4)	123,718
Brethren (4) Dunkard	122,847
Adventist (6)	95,646
Scandinavian Evangelical (3)	62,000
Mennonite (11)	54,798
Salvation Army (2)	<u>27,275</u>
	21,000,000

p. LXX

The 16,626,989 of net increase in twenty years (1890-1910) represent a growth of nearly 81%.

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

Members of the Hall of Fame born up to 1780, inclusive who were

Church members	13	62%
Non-church members	5	23%
No information	<u>3</u>	<u>15%</u>
Total	21	100%
Eliminating the Unknown		
Church members	13	72%
Non-church members	<u>5</u>	<u>28%</u>
Total	18	100%

Approximate percent of total population who were church members at the time of the Revolution, 7%.

Members of the Hall of Fame who were born between 1781 and 1810, inclusive who were

Church members	16	64%
Non-church members	5	20%
Unknown	<u>4</u>	<u>16%</u>
Total	25	100%

Eliminating the Unknown

Church members	16	76%
Non-church members	5	24%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	21	100%

Approximate percent of total population who were church members in 1810—9%.

Members of the Hall of Fame who were born between 1811 and 1855, inclusive, who were

Church members	7	41%
Non-church members	6	36%
Unknown	4	23%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	17	100%
Eliminating the Unknown		
Church members	7	54%
Non-church members	6	46%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	13	100%

Percent of total population who were church members in 1850—16%.

Total members of the Hall of Fame who were

Church members	36	55%
Non-church members	15	24%
No information	12	21%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	63	100%
Eliminating the Unknown		
Church members	36	70%
Non-church members	15	30%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	51	100%

Average percent of church membership of the whole population for whole period—ca. 12%.

In these calculations no allowance has been made for the fact that most churches count only adults as members. The practise varies considerably between the different churches, also somewhat with the times. We have another variable with the size of the family, hence a greater degree of accuracy is probably unattainable.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



138 829

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY